The
Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL.

BRITAIN is still ploughing through heavy seas, and all the resources of statesmanship will be needed if she is to weather the storm. Even if we had no responsibilities outside our own land the situation at home is serious enough, both in its material aspect and in its reaction on *morale*. Heavy taxation, depleted capital, depression in the staple industries, an unemployment total of 2,000,000—these things tend to crush the effort and sap the vitality of politicians, employers, and employed, and sometimes of religious people, too. Especially is this the case when men feel that the causes of the tempest are world-wide, and in large measure beyond their own control; despair rather than renewed effort is sometimes the outcome.

In such a time, what is the obvious duty of responsible men and women? In the political sphere it is surely to make a stand against panic legislation of whatsoever kind, either the foolish spending of money or the adoption of ill-considered tariff legislation, the probable effect of which will be to make the situation worse instead of better. Further, it should be proclaimed that those who attempt to make Party capital out of national emergencies are altogether reprehensible. Rather should men and women of all Parties get together and pull with their might until the boat reaches more peaceful waters.

Meanwhile the Churches should continue to remind the Government at every conceivable moment about the amount of money still being spent on armaments—and by a nation that has outlawed war.

* * *

THE need for all men and women of good will to get together, no matter to what Party they belong, is all the more urgent when to the burden of the industrial problem is added the no less heavy burden laid on Britain in Palestine, Egypt, and India. Not by a divided nation will the way to meet the claims of new nationalism be found. Of Palestine and Egypt we propose to say nothing here, but India should never be out of the thoughts of Christians in the next few months: they should be carefully studying the Report of the Simon Commission, and they should make the Round Table Conference the subject of continual prayer.

We have to learn to bear with patience and with understanding the charges that are being made in India—they will continue to be made with ever-increasing bitterness in the coming months—against all those who have had any share at all in the British rule. Those who love the Indian people and earnestly desire that, at the

earliest moment consistent with the maintenance of peace in their country, they should become free and independent, must not be rattled either by the extravagances of Swarajists, on the one hand, or by the equally foolish talk of British Imperialists, on the other. We must bear in mind that the Indians are gradually being awakened to what seems to them like—and often is—the exploitation of their land by an alien people, and realize that this new knowledge often blinds them to compensating benefits that have been received.

We cannot be surprised at the violence of Indian agitators when we read, let us say, Sir Walter Layton's chapter on Finance in the Simon Commission Report. It is a Christian paper in India which calls this "one of the most damning documents on the British administration of India that we have read for a long time." As we read the chapter we cannot marvel that the educated Indian has been roused. Here are some of its statements:

> 1. The mass of the people are extremely poor.
> 2. She is incurring expenditure on the primary functions of government, such as defence and the maintenance of law and order, as high in proportion to her wealth as Western nations.
> 3. Her expenditure on social services such as education, health, sanitation, *etc.*, on the other hand, is far behind Western standards, and indeed in many directions is almost non-existent.
>
> An outstanding feature is the high proportion (62½ per cent) which current expenditure on defence bears to the total expenditure of the Central Government—a higher proportion in fact than in any other country in the world.
>
> Even when account is taken of provincial and central expenditure, the ratio (31½ per cent) is still a very high one.
>
> Economically speaking, it is the most burdensome form of expenditure, and this is especially the case where, as in the case of India, the Army contains a large element drawn from elsewhere.
>
> India is seventh on the list among the Great Powers (in regard to military expenditure) and her expenditure on armaments is between two and three times as great as that of the whole of the rest of the Empire outside Great Britain.

Then, to crown all, the Indian reads that the administration of Government is

> expensive, owing to the level of salaries in the upper grades of the Indian Services, which have had to be fixed on a standard high enough to induce British members to leave their home country and to work for the best part of their life in an uncongenial climate.

Is there not abundant room for the reconciling influence of the Christian Church?

* * *

MEANWHILE those who would fish in troubled waters are not wanting. A week or two ago Mr. George Remond had an article in *L'Illustration* under the title, "Will France Get India?" Again we say, what challenge, what opportunity, our times bring to the Christian Church!

* * *

In the Summer Number of the *Yale Review* Captain B. H. Liddell Hart has a striking article on "Armament and its Future Use". Quoting Mr. H. M. Tomlinson's remark, "The war the generals always get ready for is the previous one", Captain Liddell Hart says that this is an under-statement: the war for which the generals do prepare is the one before the last. He tells us further that

> After the last war the plans of a tank, designed in 1912 and more advanced than the actual machine of 1916, were unearthed from the dusty recesses of the British War Office and found to bear this brief verdict of authority—'The man's mad'.

The purport of his article is that in order to be efficient the motorization and mechanization of armaments should proceed apace.

One cannot read an article of this kind without thinking it throws a significant light on the attitude of the churches to their task. Is it not a fact that the war organized religion is preparing for is the last war or the war before that? Are we not still using pre-war methods, with the same schemes for solving our problems, the same times and forms of services, and all the rest of it? Why is it that spiritual machinery is so antiquated and out-of-date?

* * *

And are the churches any more up-to-date in the methods they are using to remove from the world the menace of war? Marshal Foch believed that the next war would come in 10 or 15 years; Mussolini talks about a "decision" some time between 1935 and 1940. And what are the churches doing about it? Mildly blessing the World Alliance, half-heartedly running branches of the League of Nations Union, or thinking that the cause of peace has been won because an outlawry pact has been signed? The most discouraging thing about a book like Major K. A. Bratt's *That Next War?* (Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.)—translated from the Swedish by Mr. Ernest Classen and introduced by Mr. Wickham Steed—is the insignificant part played by the churches in the struggle for peace in the past, or expected to be played by them in the future. Though this particular book is open to many criticisms—it endeavours to cover far too much ground, is badly arranged, and has many repetitions (as the author's modest Preface frankly confesses)—yet it ought to be read by everybody interested in the problems of peace, for they will find in it much useful information gathered from many fields.

Major Bratt believes that the lever for securing peace "is to be found in the working classes of Western Europe," and that "for the present the whole idea of a rational organization for peace stands or falls by the international force, which must in the last resort be an international military force". Have those who call themselves by the name of Christ sadly to agree that these conclusions are correct? Have they to admit the truth and the justice of the statement, "The

attitude of the Christian Churches towards war has always been ambiguous. Not only in the form of Crusades against the heathen, but also in our day".

There must be more vigour, more sincerity, and more adaptability in the fight of the Christian Churches against war if the reproach is to be removed.

* * *

The Lambeth Conference of 1930 is over, and its *Report* has been issued. Reading it, a Buddhist or a visitor from Mars would gather that the attitude to the Free Churches of England was altogether contemptuous, and that the Orthodox Church was a great, glorious, and progressive Church with which the Anglican Communion was longing to unite. No doubt the Bishops do not intend to be contemptuous, but the impression made by a comparison between the time and space devoted to the Free Churches and to the Eastern Church cannot be escaped. And what are we to make of the point in the discussion where the Patriarch of Alexandria makes enquiry about the Anglican approach to the non-episcopal Churches? We read:

> The policy, which was outlined in the Appeal to All Christian People and might be carried out in relation to Reunion with non-Episcopal Bodies (*Bodies,* note), was fully explained, and the Patriarch said that in this kind of activity he saw the practice of the Orthodox which was known as "Economy." Some considerable discussion then took place on the question of Economy, and it was finally stated that the Orthodox position was that the Church has full authority from its Divine Founder to use Economy upon matters which concern the advantage of the Church, upon condition that it does not clash in any way with the fundamental grounds of Faith.

The Bishops must be intensely relieved that "this kind of activity" is approved by the Patriarch, but it would be interesting to have their candid views on the doctrine of Economy!

We cannot but regret that the spirit of the Lambeth Appeal of 1920 no longer finds expression, nor is the subsequent admission of the negotiating Bishops that Free Church ministries are "real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church" repeated. Instead, we have passages like these:

> But our special responsibility as an episcopal Church is to bring into the complete life of the united Church those elements which we have received and hold in trust. Chief among these, in the matter of Order, is the Historic Episcopate . . . But when we consider the problem which must be paramount in all our discussions, namely, the restoration of the broken unity of Christ's Body and the drawing together of the separated groups of His followers, we realize that one necessary element in that visible fellowship must be a ministry universally acknowledged. Thus considered, there is, at present, no ministry which fully corresponds with the purpose of God. Yet we are persuaded that the historic continuity of the episcopal ministry provides evidence of the Divine intention in this respect such as to constitute a stewardship which we are bound to discharge . . . The general rule of our Church must therefore be held to exclude indiscriminate Inter-communion, or any such Inter-Communion as expresses acquiescence in the continuance of separately organized Churches.

Again the belief is expressed that the chief difficulty in regard to union is with the interim period before all ministers are episcopally ordained, and the South India Scheme is held to offer the best way out. That Scheme is therefore blessed, but the suggestions made in regard to it distinctly stiffen it in the Anglo-Catholic direction. We have been told repeatedly—and so lately as at Bournemouth—that after thirty years the United Church of South India will be free to determine its course of action. If the Lambeth Conference's suggestions are accepted Free Churchmen need no longer be in doubt of the ultimate intention. Here it is:

> We welcome the principle of the Scheme, which is that of uniting the Churches through unification of ministries so that eventually every minister exercising a permanent ministry in the united Church will be an episcopally ordained minister, and inasmuch as the actual words in the Scheme dealing with this point have been challenged as indecisive, we hope they may be so modified as to put an end to all doubt. Similarly we suggest that the words referring to possible exceptions after the period of thirty years, which are left to the judgment of the united Church at that time, should be so modified as to make it clear that the intention is to reach finality in the unification of the ministry of the united Church.

* * *

After reading the whole Report it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the Bishops have decided that their concessions to the Free Church view were a mistake, and that they are determined to complete as quickly and quietly as possible the withdrawal from the positions they took up in 1920 and in subsequent negotiations. While we regret the failure of the Conference to move forward and the decision to retire, we welcome the clearing of the air that must now take place. We, who belong once more to "other Christian bodies", now know where the Anglican Communion stands. It would be well for all those who represent the Free Churches to state explicitly once more—there is no need of "Economy"—where we stand. We are willing to work and worship with all those who name the Name of Christ. We unchurch no body of Christ's people, united in worship, fellowship, and service. But we will not consent to bind what our Lord has made free. We refuse to set any limits to the power and grace of God. Broader than the measures of man's mind is the love of God, and the life that is the gift of His Spirit cannot be confined by the forms and organizations of men. Creeds, orders of worship, forms of government claimed to be of the *esse* of the Church, ceremonies held to be exclusive means for the transference of grace, all tend to limit what is free as air. At all costs we Congregationalists will maintain the priceless boon of this freedom. We are content so long as we can continue to win little groups of people to believe in Christ and to unite in fellowship. We trust the Spirit to lead them aright. They may adopt ways of worship unfamiliar to us: they may organize their little communities in ways

unknown to us, and work out new ways of service and new statements of belief. But we will not bind them: we trust them to the guidance of the Spirit, and they are as much the Church as are Roman, Eastern, or Anglican Churches.

Occasionally, of course, faint-hearted Congregationalists forget their heritage, and want to trust in machinery and organization rather than to the freedom wherewith Christ has made men free. They tell us that Indian Christians are rudimentary in their faith, and need bishops and synods. We seem to have read of other churches where not many wise, not many mighty, not many noble, were called—churches that made their mistakes, but which had the power to spread the Gospel and to become nursing mothers of many children. They tell us that our village churches need County Unions, Moderators, and what not, to enable them to maintain themselves and render more effective witness. There is a function for these organizations and officers, true; but if a village church begins to rely on them instead of on immediate access to the source of power its days of usefulness are numbered. Can it not be proved all down the centuries that the periods when the Church of Christ has proved unable to propagate itself have been those periods when it was trusting to organization rather than to the Spirit-given life?

* * *

We are constrained to say that if all the time and energy given since the War to discussing reunion had been devoted to fighting for peace, spreading religious education, and giving young folk sound sex-teaching, this country would have been immeasurably the better. The late Bishop of Oxford, Dr. Burge, seems to have said the right thing after all:

> After our time, if we have done our work well, our successors will be in a better position to decide the question which after all is the most fundamental of all, namely—Are we or are we not mistaken in trying to represent a Spiritual Fellowship of all Christians in terms of a highly organized Visible Church?

And again:

> I want to know when exactly this Unity of the Church they seem to want to recur existed: I don't find it in Dante's *De Monarchia,* or Cyprian, or in the *Acts of the Apostles.* I expect it is rather like the Golden Age of the pagans: and we are approaching the idea of Unity entirely at the wrong end.

* * *

We are devouring all that comes from India, on every side, in regard to the South India Scheme. Dr. A. J. Appasamy's *Church Union* (S.P.C.K., 1s. 6d.) confirms us in the view that the Anglicans are definitely aiming at an episcopal ministry, without qualification or exception, after thirty years. Dr. Appasamy argues that the Indian Church "must use these historic Creeds" and must observe the two Sacraments "ordained by Christ Himself", while "the

Episcopal form of Ministry is the most widely observed, and therefore it should be made the basis of Church life" and "Union with Rome seems terribly remote and distant, but when the time comes the United Church of South India, with her acceptance of the historic episcopate, may be welcomed by the Roman Church."

Dr. Appasamy repeats the stock argument that the Indian mind, with its *guru* tradition, finds the bishop almost essential. This always seems unconvincing to us, especially when we remember that " the deep spiritual personalities " who have counted in India have not been administrative geniuses, but saints and seers, men whose lives were concentrated on spiritual ends. Most Anglican Bishops, during the 19th and 20th centuries, at any rate, have found themselves "cumbered with much serving", and few have been able to follow that one thing needful which is the "better part." There is a world of difference between the *guru* and the average diocesan bishop!

Dr. Appasamy's admission that there has been no hearty approval and support of the Scheme in South India is worth noting.

* * *

Reading Sir Alfred Hopkinson's delightful reminiscences, *Penultima,* reviewed within, we were constrained by his references to Alexander McLaren to wonder why expository preaching has almost vanished from the churches. Of course, it may be said that Alexander McLaren was an exception, and so he was: Sir Alfred tells us that after Irving had heard him speak at the opening of the Rylands Library he said: "Good heavens, what an actor the man would have made!" But McLaren's genius lay not merely in his knowledge of the Bible, and certainly not in his dramatic power, great as both these may have been—it lay chiefly in his almost instinctive gift for recognising the essentials of a problem and applying Biblical teaching to it. *Penultima* ends with a quotation from the sermon on "Wisdom is the principal thing" McLaren preached at the Jubilee of Owen's College in 1902. Could anything be imagined more fitting for the occasion?

> But I should be unfaithful to my deepest convictions if I did not avow that I for one believe that after all learning and culture, there remain deep, primal, ineradicable, universal needs which learning and culture will never satisfy. We have all of us one human heart, and it is fashioned alike, whether it beats beneath the gown of the scholar or the jacket of the workman, and its cry, often stifled, often misinterpreted, never silenced altogether, is for God, for the living God. We need, we all need, a Person behind and above the whirl of circumstance, and the miracles of matter, on whom to lean, to whom to submit, in whom to trust, with whom to be at rest. We all need consciences to be cleansed, perverse and enfeebled and enslaved wills to be emancipated by submission to rightful authority, the power of evil within us to be broken, the seducing voices of evil without us

> to be hushed—and there is but One that can do all that for us. The glowing impersonation of the Hebrew sage has received an advancement and a realisation of which he little dreamed. It has taken flesh and blood, and has come amongst us, in Him who is the power of God and the wisdom of God, 'the Light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world', God's Son, man's Brother, King of all. He can impart to each what none else can give. Literature, science, art, have brought us priceless riches, but they leave us still poor. Their highest honour is to be second, not first—second to none but to Him, and their noblest function is to stand and cry, 'We are not that Light, but we are sent to bear witness of that Light'.

Is there anybody in the modern pulpit who is at one and the same time a master of the Bible and familiar with the problems of the human heart so that the two are brought together in preaching that "finds" men? Perhaps Dr. Campbell Morgan is the best expository preacher in the world to-day; but too often his message is vitiated by his biblical conservatism and by aloofness— perhaps more apparent than real—from the hard facts of daily life. A dozen Alexander McLarens would change the face of Christendom in a decade.

* * *

Sir Alfred Hopkinson tells how Professor Thomas Fowler of Oxford asked a student who had brought an essay on "Ideas of Truth": "Have you noticed that the idea of strict truthfulness is almost confined to the Northern nations of Europe?" and received the reply: "Is it not a fact, sir, that the idea of the importance of truthfulness is about co-extensive with the spread of Calvinistic doctrines?" The Professor thought that there was some truth in this observation. It will be a good exercise for readers of these pages to examine it! Some of them may have noticed Dr. Dibelius's references to the relationship of Puritanism to truth. In so far as we understand them we would suggest that they reflect—what we frequently find in his pages—an animus against Britain that a scientific observer should have lost ere this. He says (*England*, p. 162):

> The religious atmosphere in which the rising middle classes were living contributed little or nothing to the modification of the knightly ideal. Under Puritan influences, the knightly canons of honour and truthfulness were carried over into the domain of commerce and industry, where they created the notion of "fairness" and set the world a brilliant example. But this was no innovation in principle, and this was the only contribution of the religious atmosphere. It would really be more accurate to say that Puritanism falsified the knightly code of absolute truthfulness, by importing into this area its own questionable doctrine of the saint's adjustment to this world and its individual standard of morals. No gentleman can "tell a lie", but a "fib" is a harmless way out of many a difficulty, which plays a disastrous part not only in the contingencies of daily life, but even more harmfully in politics. . . . If a nation fights its adversary in open war, it ought not to be done without shedding pacifist tears at

the same time. To speak the full truth would be barbarous and uncivilized. . . . In any conflict between the love of truth and the other great human impulses, the religious instinct of the Puritan is far too weak to secure it the victory.

* * *

THE "Ashes" have gone to Australia, won by a team in which youth and experience were well combined. Again, the churches might learn a needful lesson. In individual churches, in conferences, and in Assemblies youth must be given its rightful place if victory is to be won.

* * *

May we venture to pass on to readers—and contributors—this little "Credo" from the *Observer*?

The written word
Should be clean as a bone;
Clear as light;
Firm as stone.
Two words
Are not as good
As one.

* * *

AMONG the articles in the next issue will be an examination of the "Conceptions of Christ found in Latin America" by Professor Don Julio Navarro Monzó, who, born in Portugal and naturalized in Argentina, has gained general respect among the thoughtful people of the sub-continent through the nature of his contributions to learning. Latin America is destined to come more and more into the centre of civilized life, and it is well that European Christians should learn all they can about its peoples. We shall also include the results of a survey of the social activities of Northamptonshire Congregationalists, the work of the Rev. J. E. Evans.

The Index for 1930 will be ready shortly.

PROFESSOR ADOLF VON HARNACK.

The sudden death of Harnack, in June of this year, has removed a notable figure in the higher thought and culture of the modern world. No name in scientific divinity has been so widely known for a generation. He had become the *doyen* of world-theology, and in some measure appeared to occupy a place by himself.

Adolf Harnack was born in 1851 at Dorpat, as the son of a Lutheran Professor of Practical Theology, and he lived to be seventy-nine. His father is known even to-day as the author of an important work on the theology of Luther which has received a new publicity through the enthusiastic recommendations of the quite modern Barthian school. But the fame of the son was to be greater far. After studying in Dorpat[1], the young man, when only twenty-three, was appointed Lecturer in Church History at Leipzig, being made an Extraordinary Professor two years later. From the first the abler students sought him out. In 1879 he entered on a full professorship at Giessen, and served there for seven years before passing on to a short term in Marburg. Berlin called him in 1888 to be its Professor of Church History. The remainder of his life was to be spent in the capital. In 1921, at the age of seventy, he was released from official duties, but continued to lecture virtually till his death. There can have been few men who knew so well how to "toil terribly". In 1923 a complete bibliography of his writings was published, containing the almost incredible number of 1,500 items. This is the sort of life-work which enables us in a certain degree to understand the literary output of such men as Thomas Aquinas in the thirteenth century (his works in one edition occupy twenty-eight folio volumes), or Mommsen, the historian of Rome, in the nineteenth. A German professor, personally acquainted with the great scholar, once remarked to me with a smile that "Harnack reads himself to sleep with Tertullian". In all probability he was one of those men who only need spend an hour with any ordinary new book to get out of it all it can give them.

Harnack's chief contribution to theology is, of course, his *History of Dogma,* familiar in the seven red-bound volumes of its English translation. The first German edition began to appear in 1886, the fourth and last in 1909. It superseded all other books on its subject, and still holds its place in the front rank. Apart from its wealth of scholarly detail (not perhaps *quite* so accurate or trustworthy as that furnished by Loofs, whom Sanday once described

1 He had never heard Ritschl's lectures, but very early the older man's influence upon him became important.

as "that most scientific of all German theologians"), the book instantly exerted influence by its contention that Greek philosophy and views of life had done very much more than had so far been realized to determine the form of dogma in the Ancient Church. Gnosticism may have been the acute Hellenization of Christianity; but, Harnack argued, in our study of dogma we have to recollect not merely that the Catholic Church was bound to the primitive Christian tradition, but that its own thought was becoming secularized. Dogma, as he puts it, "is in its conception and in its structure the work of the Greek spirit on the soil of the Gospel". Greek philosophy, the older theology of the Apologists, and the radical Hellenism of the Christian Gnostics, all combined in the work. This was the theme of the first volume. In the second, we are shown the development of dogma into Christology on a basis of natural theology (this mainly in the East), and its expansion into a doctrine of sin and grace (mainly in the West and during the Middle Ages), with the Church as foundation of all. The third volume exhibits the threefold outcome of the history of dogma in Roman Catholicism as defined at Trent and in the Vatican Decrees, in Anti-trinitarianism and Socinianism, and in Protestantism. The exposition of Luther in this last volume made a deep impression by its insight and original force.

In contending that the strictly dogmatic period of the Church came early and indeed is restricted to the first few centuries, Harnack had, of course, no thought of asserting that the history of *theology* is over, or that in that province there may not be development enough yet to come. But many scholars would hear nothing of this restriction. The history of dogma, they held, could not be confined to Christian antiquity. His insistence on the part Hellenism had played in the formation of dogma not unnaturally gave offence to many people who feared that it might contribute to lowering the authority of the doctrine of the Trinity and of the Person of Christ in the Church to-day. Some of these critics, however, were apt to forget the qualifying words cited above, *viz.*, "on the soil of the Gospel". It was far from Harnack's mind to suggest that behind the dogmas of the ancient Church—the product of a certain age and type of mind, and therefore intolerable if taken as something to be legally imposed, and silently accepted by the believer—there do not stand great religious truths. In the course of his history, he had been at special pains to bring out the multifarious connexions between changes in doctrine and changes in types of Christian piety and ideal. No child of the Reformation, accordingly, can ever read the Chalcedonian formula precisely from the same angle, or with the same intention, as its framers.

Certain verdicts on New Testament questions, set out in the

first volume, evoked sharp dissent. But at this point it is worth remarking that in Harnack's hands New Testament criticism (and several of his books are devoted to it) was on the whole wonderfully conservative. Thus, at a time when the two books were being torn asunder, he argued that the *Gospel of Luke* and the *Acts* were both composed by Luke, say in the year 62, with a corresponding date for the other Synoptics, thus placing these writings considerably earlier than did the majority of recent critics.

Three major storms arose round Harnack's personality in the course of his academic life. The first sprang up *apropos* of his call to Berlin in 1888. The extraordinary effect of his *History of Dogma* had been resented. Though the Chair to which he had been nominated with almost complete unanimity by the Faculty of Theology was that not of New Testament but Church History, a loud protest was raised by exalted Church authorities. Gossler, who held the Ministry of Worship, brought the matter before the "Cabinet," sitting under the presidency of Bismarck, with the result that the call to Harnack was definitely approved[1]. It was accepted; and henceforward growing crowds of eager and admiring students filled his Berlin lecture-room. By all accounts, there can rarely have been a lecturer more stimulating and impressive. Even for English hearers, something of Harnack's power as an erudite and reasoning orator was felt when, not long before the War, he came over to London and delivered a speech on international peace.

The second storm had the Apostles' Creed for its centre. There had been a heresy case in Germany—Schrempf was the name of the protagonist—and the question of the Church's use of the Apostles' Creed in public worship and catechetical instruction caused perplexities in many minds. Especially the Virgin Birth and the Descent into Hell became the subject of excited discussion. Some of his students appealed to Harnack for advice, and he delivered a lecture on the topic. Its publication was the signal for the most violent theological tempest Germany had seen since Strauss's *Life of Jesus*. When it had been appeased, it was seen that liberty fortunately had not suffered in the conflict. The *brochure* in which Harnack set forth popularly his theological interpretation of the Apostles' Creed ran into its twenty-seventh edition in four years.

The third disturbance arose in 1900. During the previous winter Harnack had given weekly public lectures for students of all faculties on "The Essence of Christianity". One of the audience took them down and Harnack made a few alterations in the manuscript. Well known in English under the title *What is Christianity* ?, these

1 Bismarck shortly after was given an honorary Doctorate in Theology by the University of Giessen.

lectures form a brief exposition of the Gospel of Jesus and the subsequent development of the Church. Violent controversy broke out over the book, chiefly perhaps over two sentences that became famous. The first is: "Not the Son, but the Father, has a place in the Gospel as Jesus proclaimed it", a view which, in the light say of Denney's *Jesus and the Gospel,* we may take leave to question. The second had to do with the Resurrection and ran thus: "The New Testament itself distinguishes between the Easter message of the empty grave and the appearances of Jesus on the one side, and the Easter faith on the other. Although the greatest value is attached to that message, we are to hold the Easter faith even in its absence". Orthodox thinkers detested the work and nicknamed it the "canonical book of the Ritschlian sect". But it can hardly be doubted that it brought the claims of the Gospel before multitudes of people who read little else on religion. Its circulation was unprecedented. Up to 1910, apart from fifteen translations into other languages, 100,000 copies had been printed.

As noble an example as any of Harnack's workmanship is the book known in English (in a translation from Professor Moffatt's pen) as *The Expansion of Christianity.* No picture so good of the early Church's missionary work exists anywhere. Among his works of scholarly research the monograph on Marcion (1921) was written with a considerable vein of personal feeling. Marcion had been one of his earliest subjects. A great *History of Early Christian Literature,* begun in 1893, but never carried further than the third volume in 1904, became a standard work for experts.

Harnack took little share in public Church work or Church politics. He had never held a pastoral charge and seldom preached. But, though never a member of a Church Synod, he was for ten years president of the Evangelical-Social Congress, and took a living interest in Christian proposals for social reform, the women's movement, and educational questions generally. *The Christian World,* the best religious fortnightly in Germany, of which his friend, Professor Martin Rade, has been editor for forty-eight years, was started by Harnack's first circle of students in Leipzig.

The list of his other public services is long and distinguished. From 1905 to 1921, in addition to his professorship, he held the office of General Director of the National Library, and at the opening of the new building in 1914 the Kaiser, whose confidence he possessed (not altogether to the satisfaction of some of his friends), raised him to a place in the hereditary nobility. Since 1910 he had also been President of the Royal Society of the Sciences, and in 1900 he published, by request of the members, a three-volume history of the Berlin Academy. No surprise can be felt that his literary aid should thus be desired even for topics that lay outside

his professional field, for he wrote a vigorous and lucid German prose which it is impossible to read without pleasure. In conclusion, reference must be made to his long-retained editorship, first, of the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* (of which he was joint-founder), the best theological review in Germany, and secondly, of the "Texts and Studies" series, containing scores of volumes devoted to the detailed investigation of early Christian literature.

The world will not soon look upon his like again. Behind his ceaseless labour in study, lecture-room, and public institution lay a simple and heart-felt Christian faith. Its evangelical quality may perhaps be discerned in the following memorable words:

> This I know, that Jesus Christ has not called the righteous to Himself, but those who trembled before righteousness, and that the deepest and most earnest Christians embrace Jesus Christ, not only as the Prophet, but as the Reconciler. They do not, however, rest satisfied with seeing the atonement only in the life-work of Christ. They consider also His passion and His death as vicarious. How can they do otherwise? If they, the sinners, have escaped justice, and He, the Holy One, has suffered death, why shall they not acknowledge that that which He has suffered was what they should have suffered? In presence of the Cross no other feeling, no other note, is possible.

H. R. Mackintosh.

THEOLOGY AND THE PRESENT RELIGIOUS SITUATION.

In this article what I shall attempt is a somewhat *extensive* survey of a wide field, rather than any *intensive* digging in a given corner of that field. I shall try to take in, in one bird's-eye-view, the whole situation, not in detail but in general outline or in respect of certain main tendencies. And further, I shall be discussing theology, not so much (so to speak) on its own merits as pure science but rather in close relation to the mind and attitude of the ordinary man to-day and to contemporary assumptions, prejudices, and religious needs outside of strictly theological circles.

The general modern attitude to theology seems to be very largely one of neutrality and aloofness. It is probably true that if we could only penetrate beneath the surface of people's minds we should discover a real underlying interest in discussions concerning the ultimate things of life and of the universe. But the more obvious thing is the widespread apathy towards theological problems and doctrines. Three main causes of this state of mind may be mentioned: (1) The prevailing impression that traditional theology is quite out of touch with modern knowledge and requirements, that indeed it stands for "a whole ruck of obsolete theories and antiquated muddles" (to quote the strong expression once used by the late Studdert Kennedy); (2) the assumption that theology is purely technical, couched in a jargon which is unintelligible and uninteresting to the ordinary man; (3) and most important of all, the increasing lack of interest in religion itself, owing to the insistent and overwhelming pressure of the secularities of life. Where religion itself has ceased to be a vital concern, it cannot be expected that theology, the science of religion, will retain its hold on people's minds.

I shall consider first of all the pre-suppositions which affect men's *general outlook on life* in so far as it bears on religion, and secondly men's attitude towards *the specifically Christian doctrines*.

I.

When we consider the working assumptions that constitute the mental background of the ordinary man to-day, we are struck by certain differences which mark the modern man from his predecessors[1]. It is true that it is easily possible for us to exaggerate

1 Throughout this article I must ask liberty to make frequent use without qualification of such highly generalized terms as "the modern man", "the ordinary man to-day", "modern theology". Allowances must be made for many exceptions, with which it is impossible to deal within the limits of this article. Modern life and thought are of course a mosaic of more or less conflicting tendencies. But certain features stand out as especially characteristic of our age.

the differences. There is some truth in the Frenchman's rather cynical remark that "the more man changes the more he remains the same". Yet obviously there have been great changes. In an illuminating booklet entitled *The English*[1] Mr. H. W. Nevinson writes: "When I was young I should have put religion as the first of the English people's interests, before politics and certainly before sports. . . . But within the last seventy years the change has been incalculable". He now puts religion third in the order of the Englishman's interests. There seems to be a great mass of evidence to support this view.

It does seem as if the tacit assumption behind much of our life to-day is what may be called "practical materialism", that is, materialism not as a consciously-thought-out philosophy of the universe but as a practical attitude to life. By this we mean the silent dismissal of the spiritual world as irrelevant to the real issues of life and of no practical use in the struggle for existence, not a denial of God but an ignoring of Him. The circle of life seems to be complete without Him. The spiritual world seems a vague shadow-land, outside the closed circle of the secular life where we appear to be in touch with concrete, tangible, and therefore real things. This is true not only of definitely irreligious people, but of a great many "religious" folk whose religion is a kind of otiose, intermittent sentiment reserved for Sundays and idle moments, and not allowed to break through into the self-enclosed secular sphere which embraces by far the greater part of their lives. Can we find the causes of this widely prevalent "practical materialism"?

(1) It seems to be due, in the first place, not to any consciously held system of thought, but to *the daily impact of a mechanistic civilization* on our lives, and the impression it leaves on us of its adequacy to satisfy human needs. Religion had its origin as a practical method of handling life, a way of manipulating the universe and of mastering the resources of the world in the struggle for existence. It was "a way of getting things which human beings wanted"—rain, health, good harvests, success in hunting, victory in warfare. Primitive man appealed for supernatural aid in his efforts to secure the necessities of life. (Doubtless other motives are implicit in early religion, but this motive is prominent.) That method has now been superseded by applied science, with its endless equipment of machinery. Science, too, is "a way of getting the things which human beings want". And it has proved an amazingly successful method of providing the means of satisfying man's desires—at any rate his more immediate desires. The triumphs of machinery are overwhelming, as seen not only in motor-cars, aeroplanes, wireless,

[1] 1919, Pp. 66f.

cinemas, *etc.*, which may be regarded as luxuries, but in the whole industrial system as a means of securing the primal necessities of life. Mechanism seems increasingly adequate to meet the demands of life and satisfy human needs. The result is that men have come more and more to put their trust in mechanical appliances, and rely less and less on the supernatural or spiritual. The appeal to the supernatural seems superfluous. Our mechanical ingenuity has outstripped our spiritual growth; we are dominated by machines rather than by the things of the spirit. The ordinary man does not stop to argue or reason about it. God is not disproved, but displaced.

(2) In so far as this "practical materialism" has a theoretic basis, or is grounded in a coherent system of thought at all, it may be said to be based on what may be called *Victorian naturalism,* a type of thought which is now obsolete. By this I mean the kind of philosophy that was represented by men like Huxley and Spencer. This philosophy, so influential in the Victorian age, superseded the earlier dogmatic materialism which declared that nothing is ultimately real save matter, and which was crystallized in such crude aphorisms as "The brain secretes thought as the liver secretes bile" (Carl Vogt), "Man *is* only what he *eats*[1]" (Feuerbach), "All is matter and nothing matters". This more dogmatic materialism was now toned down into a kind of agnostic naturalism, which said: We cannot know what the nature of ultimate reality is, therefore we do not say that matter alone is real or deny that spirit is real. But since we cannot know ultimate reality, we must content ourselves with the effort to explain the universe in terms of phenomena, which means for all practical purposes the phenomena of the physical or material world interpretated in mechanical terms. For the purposes of a working theory of the universe we must ignore the intangible shadow-land of the spiritual world as a mere epiphenomenon (like the shadow cast by a moving train), and concentrate on the concrete things and forces of the material world with which physical science deals. "With a view to the progress of science, the materialistic terminology is in every way to be preferred. . . . Spiritualistic terminology is utterly barren, and leads to nothing but obscurity and confusion" (Huxley).

Here again we have not a denial but an ignoring of the spiritual. But here the ignoring of the spiritual is part of a deliberate scheme of thought. Spiritual categories are regarded as irrelevant for the purpose of a scientific explanation of the universe, the only kind of explanation which is possible or worth while for us. The universe is one vast mechanism, and mechanical categories alone are adequate to interpret it. In such a world personality is a mere impotent shadow, and God a kind of a pale ghost. Scientific explanation makes

1 *Der Mensch* IST *nur was er* ISST. The play on words cannot be reproduced in a translation.

God superfluous and unnecessary. At best He need only be called in provisionally and occasionally to cover up the gaps in our scientific knowledge. He is really an alien element which cannot be allowed to break through into the closed circle of mechanism. In the Victorian age the mechanical theory was almost naïvely confident, and it looked as if it was going to be triumphant all along the line. This confidence is well expressed in the saying of Auguste Comte, "Science will finally conduct God to the frontier, and bow Him out with thanks for His provisional services". *Now, the ordinary man to-day, so far as he has a reasoned theory in his mind at all, is living on the sediments of Victorian naturalism.*

But this type of theoretic naturalism is dead, except in so far as it may be represented in a new form by the "Neo-Realism" of men like Mr. Bertrand Russell. It first broke down under philosophical criticism. Thinkers like Ward and Bergson subjected the mechanical theory to a most damaging criticism, the former in his Gifford Lectures (1896-8) *Naturalism and Agnosticism,* the latter in his *Creative Evolution* (1907)—to mention only two men and two books out of many. It came to be widely recognized that, while the mechanical theory is true up to a certain point and has great methodological value in that it enables the scientist to handle and organize his material, it yet breaks down hopelessly when it is elevated into a complete philosophy of the universe, that is, to the exclusion of categories of a non-mechanical kind, such as life, mind, purpose. The growing influence of *biological* conceptions helped immensely to emancipate thought from the tyranny of mechanical categories. For life is more than a machine. A living thing is a self-maintaining, self-adjusting, self-reproducing organism, governed by its own selective interests, in a way which cannot by any stretch of imagination be said of even the most complex and perfect mechanism. The biological way of looking at things has led to an influential type of philosophy, such as that of Bergson, which takes us far beyond the prevalent naturalism of the Victorian age.

More recently, and still more significantly, the older scientific materialism has been undermined by important movements and developments *within science itself*. The latest science is itself groping after a more spiritual interpretation of the world, and definitely discards the older mechanistic view. Again we may take two men and two books as typical. Firstly, A. N. Whitehead's *Science and the Modern World* (1926). Dr. Whitehead, widely known as an outstanding mathematical and scientific thinker, repeatedly declares that scientific materialism is dead, and he substitutes for it what he calls an "organic" view of the ultimate constitution of the universe.

> The doctrine which I am maintaining is that the whole concept of materialism only applies to very abstract entities, the products of

> logical discernment. The concrete enduring entities are organisms, so that the plan of the *whole* influences the very characters of the various subordinate organisms which enter into it. . . . The principle [of organism] is perfectly general throughout nature, and represents no property peculiar to living bodies. . . . This doctrine involves the abandonment of the old scientific materialism, and the substitution of an alternative doctrine of organism[1].

The new science begins with the "event" in space-time as the ultimate unit of the real, rather than with solid, isolated things or atoms. And

> an actual event is an achievement for its own sake, a grasping of diverse entities in a value by reason of their real togetherness in that pattern[2].

The other book is A. S. Eddington's Gifford Lectures, *The Nature of the Physical World* (1928). After a masterly survey of the most recent developments in scientific doctrine—the theory of Relativity, the Quantum theory, the structure of the atom, *etc.*—Eddington shows how the most recent research reveals a principle of indeterminacy in the very citadel of the atom itself. The quantum "jumps" of an atom cannot be predicted. There is no strict causality anywhere; what seems so is due to the law of statistical averages. "All the indications are that strict causality has dropped out permanently[3]". "Science thereby withdraws its moral opposition to free-will[4]". There was a time when human experience seemed likely to pass under the dominion of iron-bound physics. "That overweening phase, when it was almost necessary to ask the permission of physics to call one's soul one's own, is past[5]". Further, physical science gives a merely symbolic and not an intimate knowledge of reality. The exploration of the external world by the methods of science "leads not to a concrete reality but to a shadow world of symbols". It is through our mystical consciousness that we get at the reality that forms the background of the metrical symbols of science. How the tables have turned! We have seen how to Huxley and his school it was the spiritual consciousness that was described as a land of shadows of epiphenomena, while the physical world of science was something concrete and real. Now it transpires that it is through our experience of values that we get at the real world, while science gives us only a shadow world of symbols. The real has become shadowy and the shadowy real. There is nothing new in this from the standpoint of idealistic philosophy. What is new is that it is now uttered officially or semi-officially in the name of science

1 Pp. 98 f.

2 P. 130.

3 P. 332.

4 P. 295. It is fair to add that not all modern physicists would subscribe to this view. I understand that Einstein, for instance, still holds to determinism.

5 P. 344.

itself, and is illustrated in detail in the current scheme of physics. References might be made to other authorities, such as J. S. Haldane (see his Gifford Lectures, *The Sciences and Philosophy*, 1928), but these may suffice. We must not rush to the conclusion that physical science leads necessarily to the full spiritual and theistic view of the universe. That would take science beyond its own "terms of reference". But we are interested to find how the old scientific materialism has been discarded, and how science itself is now re-adjusting its finger-post so that it points towards a more spiritual view of the nature of the world. *But these new ideas have not yet filtered down to the common mind.* I repeat that the ordinary man to-day is living largely on the residuum of nineteenth century scientific thought with its strong materialistic bias. He has not yet awakened to the fact that a silent but immensely significant revolution is taking place in the scientific outlook.

What then should be the attitude of Christian theology to the tendencies, practical and theoretic, outlined above? It goes without saying that theology is committed to a spiritualistic interpretation of the universe which is the direct antithesis of the mechanistic conception that underlies so much of our modern life. Theology must therefore heartily welcome the independent testimonies of science and philosophy to the inadequacy of materialism both as a theory of the universe and as a way of life. Of course, religion does not depend for its validity solely or mainly on extraneous support, either of science or of philosophy. It is a relatively independent type of experience, containing as it does elements which are unique and not derived from other sources and which have at any rate a strong *prima facie* claim to validity like any other type of experience natural to man. Hence theology can claim relative independence within its own realm and is not tied to the apron-strings of scientific or philosophic theory. Theology's last court of appeal must be man's profounder nature, the deeper yearnings of his soul which cry out for deeper gratifications than those which the physical senses can supply, as "deep calleth unto deep". "Man shall not live by bread" —or by machines—"alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God". "As the hart panteth after the water-brooks, so panteth my soul after Thee, O God", such is the articulate or inarticulate cry of the universal heart of man. Or in the words of Carlyle, "the Shoeblack also has a Soul quite other than his Stomach".

Nevertheless, the independence of theology is *relative*, not absolute. It cannot claim complete autonomy, and refuse to take cognizance of, or to come to terms with, the development of human thought outside its own boundaries. For truth is ultimately one, and if materialism is really true in philosophy it cannot be false in

theology. We therefore welcome the signs that modern thought outside theology is refusing any longer to support the bias of the "natural man" against religion.

(3) Something must be said about the *"New Psychology"* in its relation to the modern attitude to religion, though we can here find room for only the briefest reference to the subject. There can be no doubt that the "New Psychology" is having considerable influence on the popular mind. Its alleged results and findings have been somewhat prematurely popularized in numberless books and press articles. The consequence is a strengthening of the suspicion that religion is nothing more than a subjective illusion, or a kind of pious fraud with which men have in the past doped themselves. The psychological theories of the Freudians reduce man into a conglomeration of animal instincts and complexes; God becomes a mere projection of subjective wishes on the screen of the universe; prayer is mere auto-suggestion; and religion is a mere mirage due to picture-thinking. Personally I am convinced that the popularity of these half-baked theories is but a passing phase. I have no desire to under-estimate the real value of the contributions of the Freudian school within certain limits. But taken as a whole this type of psychology, owing to its over-specialization along certain limited lines of research, has lost the sense of perspective and has exaggerated the place in life of certain elemental instincts (especially that of sex). Moreover, as has often been pointed out, in denying the objective validity of religious experience it has overstepped its rights. The psychologist as such is not competent to pronounce judgment on the validity of experience or on the nature or reality of its object. Its concern is with the process of experiencing and not with the truth of that which is experienced. It is absurd to imagine that by analysing the subjective processes of experience—even granting that the analysis be psychologically correct and adequate—we are explaining away the objective reality of that which is experienced. If we argued consistently on these lines, there would soon be no reality left outside the states of our own mind, and it would be literally true to say that "we are such stuff as dreams are made of, and our little life is rounded with a sleep". It does seem that this type of psychology has occupied a disproportionate place in the popular mind, owing to its somewhat sensational character and the fact that it pandered to the abnormal and morbid mentality created by the war. And the American theory known as "Behaviourism" is, if anything, still more one-sided. I believe that the true line of development lies in following up the far saner and sounder psychological method of men like James Ward. The important contributions of Prof. Wm. McDougall supply an effective antidote against mechanistic and "behaviouristic" psychology.

II.

We have now to consider the modern attitude towards *the more specifically Christian beliefs*. So far we have been concerned with certain pre-suppositions which influence men's general outlook and which at the very outset encourage a kind of passive acquiescence in materialistic or secularistic standards of life and thought. Christian theology is confronted with the task of removing these preliminary prejudices by showing the inadequacy of materialism or naturalism as a final philosophy of life. But even when that has been accomplished there still lies before it the more positive task of interpreting Christian truth in modern terms.

And here on the very threshold we are confronted with the question of *authority*. Dean Inge has succinctly summarized the present situation in a sentence : "The centre of gravity in religion has shifted from authority to experience". It has been pointed out (by Dr. Oman and others) that the real crisis in modern Christianity took place, not at the Reformation, but some centuries later, when all the external authoritative infallibilities began to succumb before historical criticism. At least in the Protestant world, the last century witnessed the collapse of all the external props—external, that is, to Christian experience itself—which had so far supported the structure of the Christian faith. This change was in many ways a salutary one. In throwing us back upon the resources of our own inner life it has made religion a matter of personal adventure and has encouraged the spirit of experiment and discovery. But where there has been no strong internal experience to take the place of the old external authority the result has sometimes been calamitous. For when the props are removed there is danger lest the whole fabric of faith may fall to the ground and the inmates be left spiritually homeless. And yet there can be no going back to the method of external infallible authority. Progress is not possible by a cowardly obscurantism but only by an open-minded facing of the facts and by courageous loyalty to our sincerest insights. The task of modern theology is to interpret Christianity as a gospel which is *intrinsically* (not extrinsically) authoritative, that is, as something which carries authority because of its intrinsic truth, its "satisfyingness", its adequacy to human need, its practical effectiveness when put to the test of life. This way of stating the case may savour somewhat of Pragmatism. But we may surely lay hold of the element of truth in Pragmatism without thereby committing ourselves to the theory in its extreme form.

In the past the two chief seats of external authority in theology have been the Church and the Bible, the former chiefly in the Catholic world, the latter mainly in Protestantism. A brief word must be said on each of these. The *Church* has not, in Protestant circles, been regarded as an infallible authority. But it has enjoyed

a kind of supernatural prestige and has been surrounded with a sort of a halo as the society of God's people. Now, however, this has largely gone. The Church has come to be widely regarded as a very human and imperfect institution. The Church will have to win its spurs over again. If it is to command respect it must *win* and *deserve* respect. It cannot count on enforcing respect and obedience *de jure,* apart from what it actually is and does.

Within Protestantism, the *Bible,* regarded as verbally inspired, was until modern times looked upon as the seat of unquestioned authority. But now it too has been brought down from its high pedestal of infallibility. Theology no longer appeals to it as to an infallible oracle equally authoritative in all its parts, but studies it as a human document which chronicles the progressive self-revelation of God in history. To many of us the critical and historical study of the Bible has immensely humanized the book without in the least lessening the moral force of its Divine appeal. Within and through the *vox humana* that speaks in its pages the authentic *vox divina* is clearly heard by those who have hearts to feel and minds to understand. But it is to be feared that many people, depending as they do on casual remarks and snippety press references, are merely picking up some of the negative results of criticism, without any understanding of their positive significance. This is one reason why the Bible is rapidly losing its pride of place in the public mind and is being increasingly ignored. Having smashed the idol of verbal inspiration, it still falls upon theology to interpret constructively the idea of progressive revelation in such a way as to commend the Bible as a living book for ordinary men and women and not as a mere academic text-book.

Perhaps the chief stumbling block of the Bible to the modern reader is the place it gives to *miracles.* The idea of "natural law" or of the "uniformity of nature" has filtered down even to the unscientific mind of the man in the street. He tacitly assumes that the processes of nature are controlled by immutable laws. In view of this, what should be the attitude of theology? I believe it should frankly recognize that belief in miracles is not essential to the Christian faith. Such a belief should not be made an article of the standing or falling Church. It is possible that the "miracles of healing" may be explained as simply applied psycho-therapeutics, and that "casting out devils" may turn out to be an old-world expression for what would now be described as the uprooting of repressed complexes by psycho-analysis. In that case they cease to be miracles in any strict sense and become assimilated to the idea of "natural law." Much more difficult is the case of such miracles as "raising the dead" and "walking on the sea". In view of the "miracles" of science we dare not dogmatize and assign fixed limits

to the power to control nature. But emphatically we should not stake the truth of the Christian revelation of God upon such alleged happenings, lest we be found building upon shifting sand. Surely the truth of the Christian religion stands or falls with the spiritual values that are revealed in Jesus—that supreme personality which may be described as the crowning instance of a *moral* "miracle" without breach of natural law. This is in line with the principle of evolution as interpreted by modern idealists (*e.g.*, Prof. Pringle-Pattison) and by some modern realists (*e.g.*, Prof. Alexander), who teach that the emergence of new values is consistent with continuity of process. In such a scheme of thought there is no room for miracle in the generally accepted sense of the term. But the essential truth—the appearance of higher values which are not reducible to anything lower in the scale than themselves—is conserved. Such values may be called supernatural relatively to what stands below them ; but they are not miraculous in the sense of being a break in the chain of natural law. The personality of Jesus may be interpreted as the culminating instance of the emergence of value within continuity of process, *i.e.*, as supernatural without being miraculous. He came not to destroy but to fulfil the laws of the natural as well as of the moral world.

This leads us right up to the central doctrines of the Christian faith. These doctrines have largely ceased to function in the modern mind. They are not so much disproved as disused—and to be disused is surely the worst fate that can overtake a doctrine. What avails it that doctrines be true in the abstract if they be found of no use in the concrete situations of life? It is really in such situations that their truth is to be vindicated. And it ought to be the business of modern theology to re-interpret the central doctrines of our religion so that they may be felt to be relevant to the real problems and tasks of life and to throw a flash of light on the meaning and purpose of our existence.

It would appear that the three cardinal doctrines of the Christian faith are the doctrine of Salvation, the doctrine of the Person of Christ, and the doctrine of God. We mention them in this order on the ground that this is, in the main, the order of experience. If we followed the *logical* order, as is customary in books on Systematic Theology, we should begin with God, the major premise of all existence, then proceed to the Person of Christ as the supreme revealer of God in history, then to the *work* of Christ in human salvation. But it is more in accordance with the modern inductive method to begin with the concrete Christian experience, and to work up from that to the Person of Christ, then from Christ to the being and nature of God.

As to the doctrine of Salvation, it is well known that the

so-called "plan of salvation" filled a most important place in the older systems of theology. But that "plan" has lost its power of appeal to the modern man, largely because it seems altogether too formal, schematic, and complicated. In the old theology, with its strained ideas about original sin, vicarious penalty, imputed guilt, imputed righteousness, the machinery of salvation became overweighted and unwieldy. There is need to-day of a simpler and more straightforward presentation of the gospel truths which were striving to be expressed in the old elaborate formulæ. I am not pleading for a "simple gospel" in any superficial sense. Life itself is an exceedingly complicated, not a simple, thing; and there is a sense in which the gospel must be at least as complicated—that is, as rich—as life. But the theology of salvation needs to be relieved of such *artificial* complexity as was formerly imposed upon it by an overstrained logic. It must be in tune with the ultimate moral simplicities which underlie the baffling complexities of life.

There is as much need as ever of a positive and adequate gospel of salvation. It is true that on the surface the modern man does not seem to be aware of his need of salvation. He does not ask with acute anxiety as his fathers did, "What must I do to be saved?". The reason for this is that he has no acute sense of sin, at least under the name "sin". As Sir Oliver Lodge has said in words that have often been quoted, "The modern man does not worry about his sins". So much the worse for the modern man! He does, however, worry about certain inner disharmonies of his life which he calls by such names as "repressed complexes". And he does profoundly need such deliverance as can only come by the unification of self round some satisfying object of love and loyalty. If our theology does not include a dynamic gospel of salvation it must be proclaimed hopelessly inadequate. But it must be added that our idea of salvation must include *social* redemption as well as the redemption of the individual. It will not suffice to save the individual and then leave him to find out as best he can the social expression of his new life. The Gospel of Christ is concerned not only with the personal life, but also with the institutions of society as both the expression and training-ground of personality. Individual salvation is a truncated thing without social salvation.

And it remains as true to-day as ever that the hope of men's deliverance lies in Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the world—in His teaching and personality, and especially in His life of utter self-abandonment culminating in the Cross. The incomparable moral appeal of the Cross remains. It may not be possible to revive the old theory of an "objective" atonement, as a satisfaction offered by Christ to meet some divine necessity, a sacrifice which has value to God on our behalf independently of the impression it produces on

the minds of men—a kind of transaction between Christ and the Father enacted as it were above our heads. The modern interpretation of the Cross moves much more on Abelardian than on Anselmic lines. That is, the stress is more on the ethical appeal of the vicarious suffering of love than on anything transactional, legalistic, or strictly substitutionary. But this simplification of the doctrine of atonement must not and need not be at the expense of minimizing the significance of the Cross as "the power of God unto salvation". The gospel must be shown to be the power of *God*—of God Himself objectively and creatively acting in history, especially in Christ and His Cross. Central prominence must be given to the reality of *grace*, or the Divine initiative in salvation. No merely subjective view can suffice.

From the work of Christ we are led to His Person. The modern man holds Jesus Christ in deepest respect. But speaking generally, it is the human Jesus, not Christ the Divine Saviour, that appeals to him. Well, modern theology, too, *begins* with the human Jesus. Appreciation of the teaching, character, personal life and experience of the human, historical Jesus is the starting-point of the typically modern Christology, rather than logical abstractions such as the "two natures" regarded as distinct substances lurking behind His historic attributes. A doctrine of His divinity can be built on that basis. His divinity is not something separate from His humanity, superimposed upon it or absorbing it. He was most divine where he was most human in the ideal sense. The quality of His human character was divine. The Jesus of the Gospels leaves upon us the inescapable impression that we have in Him something ultimately true and satisfying, something which God Himself cannot excel in quality. He is thus to us "the image of the invisible God". But whatever may be our final interpretation of Him, theology should insist that the essence of the Christian religion is, not a creed about Him (though some sort of a creed is implied), but personal loyalty to Him and fellowship with His Spirit. Personal loyalty to Christ will be found to be the same thing as personal loyalty to God. That is surely the heart and soul of the New Testament[1].

Thus we are led finally to the doctrine of God. We know God in Christ; this, as we have just suggested, is the essence of Christianity. But what does the modern man think of God? Men's ideas of Him seem to oscillate between two extremes. On the one hand, some have no difficulty in retaining a naïvely anthropomorphic view of God as a kind of magnified Man, a celestial Magistrate, or such a Person as is described at the beginning of *Genesis* at "walking in the garden

[1] I have worked out fully the point of view of the above paragraph in Chap. viii of the composite work, *The Lord of Life*, by Dr. Vernon Bartlet and others (S.C.M., 1929).

in the cool of the evening". On the other hand, some have difficulty in conceiving God as anything other than a kind of vague intangible spiritual ether, or "a sort of a Something" to which they can scarcely assign a local habitation or a name. Now there is in both these views an element of truth which theology should seek to conserve. On the one hand (to take the latter view first) God is too great and transcendent to be fully defined in terms of human concepts or visualized in terms of human imagination. Otto has greatly helped us to appreciate anew this point of view by his insistence on God as the *mysterium tremendum,* the awe-inspiring mystery which eludes apprehension in terms of concepts. The new astronomy may be utilized to help to drive this home to those who have too definite, narrow, and stereotyped a conception of God. How immensely and mysteriously great God must be, that He should fill and control the inconceivably vast universe of modern science! This, however, suggests only a *quantitative* measurement of the Divine magnitude. To religious experience, as Otto has pointed out, God's holiness is a felt *quality* of a unique kind. Jesus, too, reveals God as the unique and transcendent "Lord of heaven and earth". He would doubtless have accepted the prophet's description of God as "the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy". But He did not leave the matter there. He gave definite content and character to the Great Transcendent Mystery and called it "Father". The heart of the mystery of the universe is fatherly love and goodness. And this embraces the element of truth in the first, the anthropomorphic, view mentioned above. For "fatherhood" is surely a frankly anthropomorphic idea, and yet is adopted by Christ as the highest category by which God can be made real to the mind and heart of man. And His own sense of sonship was a reflexion in experience of His idea of God's fatherhood.

It is the task of theology to seek to do justice to both these elements in men's experience of God—(1). God's transcendent mystery and glory evoking within us awe, humility, reverence, and godly fear, and (2). His warm and homely intimacy, nearness, helpfulness, love, evoking within us a desire to draw nigh unto Him and hold fellowship with Him in filial confidence, gratitude, and affection, which is what is meant by calling Him Father. Such a presentation of God cannot but appeal to the deepest mind and heart of our age and of every age.

I have left myself no room to discuss the important question whether the Christian conception of God necessarily involves a doctrine of Trinity, and if so how that doctrine is to be presented so as to make it specially relevant to the present religious situation. But who can compass a whole system of theology in one brief article?

D. Miall Edwards.

THE LIMITATIONS OF WESTERN CHRISTIANITY.

The study of English Christianity is a very interesting subject to a man from the East, and when that study is of personalities and organizations which are devoting themselves to bringing about the Christianization of the world it becomes still more fascinating. The whole position of British missionaries is jeopardized because of their connexion with a country which has the political administration of a big portion of the world under its wings. Brought up in Schools and Universities where the glories of the British Empire are dinned into their ears, and where the Providential call to the British Race to manage the affairs of the world is almost a tenet of faith, it ought not to be difficult to understand the peculiar mentality which governs the zealous outlook of the majority of these ambassadors of the Gospel. The sincerity of their motives can never be questioned for a moment, but they have their limitations in so far as they can lead the backward races of the world along a certain path and up to a certain point and then there comes a dead stop.

In dealing with a country like India, with its ancient religious systems, the impact of Christianity through foreign agencies is creating an interesting position. An Indian Christian of the third generation, placed in the midst of the modern cross-currents of Hindu thought and the evangelistic outlook of the Britishers, sees the situation rather dazed and even at times puzzled. He wonders at times if the hope which the missionary has so often expressed that India must be evangelized by her own sons can ever be realized in his person, and specially if it can be done in the way that the missionary expects it to come. "An indigenous Christianity and an indigenous Church" are the pious hopes of all those who are now running various organizations of conversion, and of all those who are giving their lives to this end in far-off fields of service. Who is to lead this indigenous Church? Who is to give expression to the ideas that will be peculiarly Indian? Who will make a contribution to the understanding of a Gospel like St. John's? Will these leaders of the indigenous Church of the future come from amongst those who are animists or lacking a religious background, or will they be found in the ranks of the more thoughtful, the cultured and the mystical and philosophical elements of Hinduism?

The success of Christian Missions has so far rested in the social services which they have pioneered, and the new conscience which they have awakened in India regarding the responsibility of the Hindu towards those around him. The life of India is certainly richer for her contact with the active elements of Western religion. The time is not far off, however, when these hospitals and schools

and colleges which have formed the main basis of missionary appeal will be taken over by the State, for it is considered to be the elementary duty of the Government to supply these needs of her people. The difficulty will arise when the traditional outlook of organized Christianity comes into collision with the personal aspect of religion that Hinduism believes in.

Thinking India to-day is very critical of all things Western. She admits that the social services the Churches of the West have rendered her have been very helpful; she gives credit to Western personalities for uplifting the outcastes of India; but she hesitates to associate herself with that organic religion which has made these services possible. Is it due to any suspicion on her part that this open association with the West might mean cutting herself completely from her own past, and giving up those things which she has cherished through the centuries? Or, is it that old India feels that she can, while remaining Hindu in her organism, still assimilate and imbibe whatever this modern cult can give her? She is to-day weighing up carefully the Christian claims to superiority and the uniqueness of Christ.

The fact of the matter is that India is very sensitive in these days about the attacks which have been made upon her in the name of Christ by His followers and messengers. The eternal caste system has come under the missionary hammer pretty forcibly. It has formed the main topic of addresses at meetings in both America and England. It has been called an inhuman, cruel, and soulless institution. As against that, the critics of the system have put the noble conception of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man as taught by Jesus. In their great zeal these critics have forgotten that the principle on which the system was based still prevails in the missionary-sending countries. The Colour Bar in Church life in both America and South Africa is very noticeable, and, so long as it remains there, what right have the missionaries to condemn the Hindu system? The outcaste cannot enter the Temple, nor can the coloured man enter the same railway carriage as a white man; the outcaste cannot draw water from a caste well, nor can the coloured traveller enter the restaurant car. When Christian ministers begin to pay the price of discipleship and experience ostracism at the hands of their fellow whites for taking communion with the black man, or eating in his restaurants, or travelling in his carriages and becoming fellow passengers with him in the journey of life, then we shall admit that the day of victory for Jesus has arrived. Not till then. A Hindu lady, educated in America, and having spent a few months in Africa, returned to India, and during a discussion remarked quite naturally, "We must not cultivate the Christian's race prejudice."

It is amazing how statements like the above shock the insular English Christians, and when it is brought home to them they get troubled and are apt to get less enthusiastic about their missionary responsibilities. Would it be best to leave them alone, and not to disturb their immature minds, and let them continue to believe that Hinduism and Hinduism alone is cursed with this system of untouchability and inhumanity? The secession from Hinduism into the Christian fold which marked the ministry of Alexander Duff so conspicuously was due to the great contrast which Duff's presentation of human values as taught by Jesus showed as against the practical Hinduism of that period which found expression in customs like suttee, infanticide, the tyranny of caste, *etc.* Priest-ridden Hinduism had no room for men like Raja Ram Mohan Roy and Keshub Chandra Sen. Moreover, the world outside was unknown to India, and therefore she was willing and ready to hear what Christian missionaries had to tell her. Times have now changed. A new India has come into being; the facilities of travel and stay abroad have brought the deeper problems of Christendom right to the very doors of India, and the platitudes of organized Christianity are coming under the searchlight of Hindu thought.

The World War has further contributed to this halt in Christian advance. The progress that we hear of is amongst those who are still unaware of the forces which are at work outside India, who look upon their village as their world, the Brahmins as their enemy, and the missionary as their friend. What do they know of the struggle that Western nations went through in 1914? What do they know of the moral issues involved in a question like war and peace? Their literate knowledge is confined to leaflets that Christian organizations publish dealing with personal matters like drink, debt, dirt, and disease, or with morality. Nor is it any use telling these people of these world-wide upheavals. They will not understand. But that nevertheless leaves the foreign preacher in the eternal dilemma as to what will be the reaction on these converts of his when, with minds awakened and faculties sharpened, they launch out into the world? Would it not be wiser for him to be conscious of the outlook of those who are already in the mental stage of viewing the world as a whole? Over two million "heathens" of India were involved in the political differences of Christendom. They had seen brutal sights amongst Christians; war books which show the ghastliness of the whole process of a highly-civilized society are in the hands of the educated Indian; we see regimental colours still being dedicated at Parade Services in the name of Christ; battleships are still launched with all the solemnity of a Christian crusade; ecclesiastical leaders are still wrangling over the

pros and *cons* of a righteous warfare; the New Testament is still the charter of killing fellow-Christians by means of bayonets. The Sermon on the Mount, which has attracted hundreds upon hundreds of non-Christians to the admiration of Jesus, was declared a seditious document in the last war. It seems as if the teachings of Jesus were unable to meet the deeper needs of a materially enslaved Christendom. The Hindu points out that this Jesus ideal is an impracticable one, that in the last analysis even professing Christian ministers of religion, at home and abroad, would depend for their victory on the elements of destruction rather than on the Spirit of the Master. And we know that in the case of another war organized Christianity will again rally around the forces of the State and will compromise itself with the deities of slaughter. The few faithful who will refuse to take up arms will be howled down as traitors, and unpatriotic. Christianity works and has a message when all is smooth and quiet, but is anathema when its witness is most needed. The zeal of the religious people goes beyond that of the professional soldier and statesman, and the various denominations will still vie with each other in the expression of their loyalty to the standards of a worldly-minded State. "Does Christianity work, has it worked, in these big issues?" asks the Hindu seeker after truth. What answer is the missionary to give, or the Presidents and members of the various Boards?

Another factor which we cannot afford to overlook in the present state of the Hindu mind is the growing change in the body politic of Hinduism itself. True to its age-long traditions, Hinduism considers itself continually open to new forces and new contacts. It is not static, nor does it owe its allegiance to any one particular personality like Buddha, Jesus, or Mohammed. It is a system of thoughts believing in the fundamental trinity of creation, preservation, and death; around this the thought-forces of the world work, and around these three unshakeable facts of life and experience new movements come into being, and new personalities issue forth the clarion call of repentance and regeneration.

Hinduism is hospitable enough to allow Islam, Zoroastianism, Judaism, and Christianity to flourish and grow side by side, keeping itself open to the reactions and influences of each. It believes that within its own social organism it can give enough latitude to its followers to get from each system of religion what they like, and what suits them best. Is not a person who is willing to learn the truth wherever he can get it, and to see the light wherever it comes from, more open-minded, liberal, and charitable than the one who in a dogmatic fashion just holds on to his own tenets and will not see that he himself is guilty of the charge of bigotry while condemning others of it? And let us face the fact frankly that an orthodox

Christian is more pugnaciously bigoted than anyone else. His sympathy with the religious experiences of others has a kind of patronizing air which makes the more earnest seeker smile. We cannot afford to ignore the vital spiritual experiences of others, who through channels different from ours are trying to know and understand the same source of all light and wisdom. And if we could once with a mental and logical effort divest ourselves of the traditional thinking in which we have been brought up, we should find it difficult to point out exactly the points on which the great mystics of all sects disagree with each other. We should find them very much alike, for they have broken through the shackles of religious divisions and "isms", and entered into a deeper perception of divine truth. In my own life I have met a great Moslem saint like Dr. Nazir Ahmed of Delhi, the poet Rabindranath Tagore, and the weaver of Sabarmati, Gandhi, and the question that has been forced upon me time and again is, In what do these men differ from the average missionary who goes out to convert them? In fact, I would say that they are miles ahead of him in their personal mystical experience, in their experiments with God, in their God-consciousness, in their practical sympathy with suffering humanity and in their internationalism, and above all in their readiness to put the Sermon on the Mount into practice. Put Tagore and Gandhi by the side of any mystic of the Christian Church, and you will be amazed at the variety of points on which they agree, and in matters of spiritual experience you will find hardly any difference. The question which we Indian Christians, looking at the unworthiness of our own lives, ask ourselves is, In what way precisely would Gandhi or Tagore be better than what they are? Is there a Christian minister of religion existing who can go to these men with something more than what they possess? And yet, Jesus did not come in vain. He came to give men something more than they had before Him. Can they not take that something from Him and incorporate it in their lives? The claims of Higher Hinduism and Brahma Samajists need careful consideration, and if India is to come into line with the mind of Jesus these ancient systems of her own soil have to be revitalized and not uprooted.

The supremacy and uniqueness of Jesus which form the basis of the Christian enterprize can never be established in India until the same Jesus first becomes absorbed in the Hindu pantheon. Those wonderful carvings and symbols which decorate the pillars and towers of India's temples have a meaning, and a very real meaning, for the Hindu pilgrim or devotee. To the Westerner brought up on psalms, and organ recitals, and a cold calculated form of worship, they just look hideous. His Puritanical and Protestant spirit revolts at the sight of them. But charity demands that he should try

to understand what they actually mean to the man standing before them with folded hands and an ecstatic expression. They are real to him, and they speak to his soul. Men of various castes of artisans have in those images given expression to their devotion for their religious heroes : they have tried to immortalize their ideas, and their deeds of goodness and valour, in terms of stone and wood carving. And it is when the artisans of India begin to express their love for Jesus in their art, literature, and song that Christianity will take on an indigenous form. It is when the sculptor will take his hammer and chisel and begin to put into stone some great deed of Jesus, healing the sick, comforting the broken-hearted, giving beauty for ashes; and when the musician will go about playing his seven-stringed instrument from door to door and put into verse the love of Jesus for suffering humanity, and echo His words of cheer, solace, and encouragement to those under the burden of sin and shame, that we shall be talking of Jesus taking root on Indian soil. Until then we are just touching the surface, and supplying to India a gospel of service, but we are not getting deep down into the recesses of her soul. Let us stop talking in terms of patronage and superiority, and begin to realize our common need of a new experience and a new life, and give the Lord of Life a chance to establish His realm of love, peace, and goodwill in the hearts of both Europe and Asia.

Shoran S. Singha.

POLITICS AND THE GOSPEL.

In speaking of the Gospel, it is well worth recalling what Jesus Himself meant by it. On the momentous occasion when first He sent out His followers to declare it to the world, He said to them, "As ye go, preach, saying, The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand. Heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse the lepers, cast out devils". These words are not an explanation or interpretation of the Gospel nor an inference from its principles. They are the terms in which Jesus delivered it to the disciples.

It may surprise us to discover afresh how much the Gospel was concerned from the beginning with men's bodily ills and physical well-being. The charge to heal the sick was linked with the first commission to proclaim the Kingdom. We speak sometimes of the "social implications" of the Gospel, as if the Gospel were primarily something else, though capable of certain social applications. But the so-called social implications of the Gospel are not implications at all; they are its first principles, and were expressly stated in the first instructions for its proclamation. The social Gospel is not "another Gospel". It is the original Gospel. It *is* the Gospel, as Jesus Himself understood it, as He authorized it, and as He wished it to be made known to the world. It is the Gospel as He Himself proclaimed it. The lines which Jesus laid down for the disciples to follow in the service of the Gospel were precisely those which He followed Himself. "Jesus went about all the cities and the villages", we are told, "preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing all manner of disease and all manner of sickness".

It is the genius of Christianity that it holds the spiritual and the material together and will not let them be separated. The Gospel no more shrinks from contact with the physical side of life than God shrank from the Incarnation. In the Gospel as Jesus described it we find this two-fold instruction : to proclaim the Kingdom, and to heal the sick. Jesus tells His apostles, as He sends them forth, what they are to say and what they are to do. They are to declare that the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand and they are to heal every form of disease they meet. These two instructions were intimately connected in the mind of Jesus, and both of them have a direct bearing on politics. The first gives to politics its inspiration and the second indicates its programme.

I.

The inspiration which politics needs is faith in a better order which is both possible and near. That is the faith which speaks in "the Gospel of the Kingdom". "Tell them", Jesus says in effect,

"that the Kingdom of Heaven can come on earth". Such a faith means that politics is worth while. It is the root of the conviction that politics is not a vain endeavour in a hopeless world, not a beating of the air, not a dream and a delusion, but that it is striving to do what can be done. Political problems are not insoluble conundrums flung down in mockery from above: they are tasks which can be accomplished by thinking God's thoughts after and with Him. Politics is not running against a stone wall but thrusting at doors which will yield to pressure. This faith that what is right is also possible has inspired the ardour and the determination which have carried great causes to victory against all opposition, and without it progressive politics could not survive.

The Good News of the Kingdom, moreover, declares that the better order is near as well as possible. Tell them, says Jesus, that the Kingdom is "at hand": it is within their grasp! That is the faith which keeps the pace hot. One of our political parties to-day is supposed to have been somewhat embarrassed by one of its wings, which has had the daring to demand the realization of its programme "in our time". Such a demand may be embarrassing to party leaders, but it strikes the authentic note of the Gospel. Every political party ought to demand the realization of its programme "in our time"; and in fact every party does. One party—if a rough description may be allowed—seeks commercial prosperity; another seeks peace, at home and abroad, as the essential condition of prosperity; a third seeks socialism as prosperity for all. But each party promises to deliver its goods "in our time" and even in the next five years! No party would dream of saying before a general election, "If we are returned you may see some slight change in twenty years". All alike declare, "Put us in power"—that is the essential condition!—"and we shall have prosperity, peace, socialism, in our time". That is how Jesus wanted the Gospel to be preached. "The Kingdom in our time" was His message. He used almost the identical expression. "This generation shall not pass away, until all these things be accomplished."

What exactly Jesus meant by those strange words is a momentous and fascinating problem. Did His eager faith miscalculate the forces against Him and underrate men's inertia? Did His prophetic vision fore-shorten history or did He speak as One to Whom one day is as a thousand years? Whatever else critics may make of the problem, Jesus was clearly laying down in this dramatic expression a principle fundamental to all His teaching, namely, that according to men's faith it is done unto them. He is holding out to His and every generation the possibility of swift and mighty changes. He was saying, as the political parties say, "Put *Me* in power, and the Kingdom will come in our time". When two blind men once groped their

way into His presence, they were met by the question, "Believe ye that I am able to do this?". That same question, with both its challenge and its promise, meets every age across the threshold of its hopes. Every generation wins as much of the Kingdom as it has faith to seize. Change is possible to it, so abrupt and miraculous, that it can only be likened to the transition from darkness to light.

We need not be afraid of expecting too much through our politics. We do not expect enough; we are not impatient enough. We can be sure that we are far behind God's time-table for man's redemption. Perhaps the truest interpretation of that strange word of Jesus about the accomplishment of all things touching His Kingdom in His generation, is that it is a cry of divine impatience with the slowness of man's salvation. It used to be an axiom of science that Nature does not make a leap. Further investigation has shown that Nature does make leaps, sometimes so prodigious that that seems hardly any connexion between one step and the next, and students of natural history are left looking for "missing links" which will never be found because they were never there.

Human history, which is the story of human nature in action, can also make leaps. It can make leaps backwards as well as forwards. It can sink back into a new Dark Age, and it can rattle back to barbarism. There is nothing inevitable in either progress or decline. Periods have come of such stagnation that they cannot even be regarded as seed-times of future harvests, for the very seed was rotting in the ground. But neither is delay inevitable. The Gospel knows very little of "the inevitability of graduainess". Even the parables of the Blade of Wheat, the Mustard Seed, and the Leaven are illustrations not so much of the slow and steady growth of the Kingdom, as of its amazing increase from small beginnings, and its rapid and widespread action from a tiny nucleus. Of the *necessity for* gradualness the Gospel knows nothing. It speaks instead of the proximity of the Kingdom.

Faith in the nearness of the Kingdom, as well as in its moral possibility, is continually receiving in the political sphere remarkable vindication. There may have been many people who were disappointed that the mightiest clash of armaments which the world has ever witnessed was not immediately followed by a perfect and perpetual peace. Future generations may look at these matters very differently. They may be amazed at the fact that within ten years of the close of that world-wide conflict the nations of the earth had pledged themselves to end war for ever. They may well look with awe upon that achievement, as an extraordinary exhibition of human capacity for moral self-determination, for abrupt change and swift advance. The fact that such long strides forward are possible should be of immense encouragement and inspiration to all who are engaged

in politics. The Good News of the nearness of the Kingdom is a sure corrective to political war-weariness and to the creeping-in of any insidious suspicion that the vision is a delusion and the task in vain. We shall not say the struggle naught availeth if we can believe that it is out of the fountains of God's Own concern for His children that the main comes flooding in. Jesus knew that the faith of His friends faltered and quailed before the tremendous vision and task of the Kingdom. But He struck at the roots of all human despair when He said, "Fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the Kingdom". This better order, after which in all our politics we strive and strain, is the gift of God. He means it for us and He means us for it. Not that at some point in history, arbitrarily selected by the Father and cryptically revealed in the Scriptures, that order will arrive. But the Kingdom for which our human nature at its best has always yearned, has no obstacle to its attainment save that same human nature at its worst. It is the Father's good pleasure that we should have it and that we should have it soon. That is the Good News which gives inspiration to politics.

II.

The second instruction which Jesus gave to His disciples when commissioning them for the service of the Gospel was to heal the sick. It was the commonest human ills which moved the mighty compassion of Jesus, and He sent His followers out to cure them. Those commonest ills were in His day "all manner of disease and all manner of sickness", and, alas!, it is still the same to-day. Disease is still the ubiquitous sign that the devil is at work amongst us. There has been a tendency to "spiritualize" these words of Jesus, to allege that He was thinking primarily of men's moral and spiritual sicknesses. This unfortunate tendency has given to Christian Science the opportunity for its protest against the Church's neglect of faith-healing. The undue emphasis that Christian Science has placed upon physical health may have made it a heresy, but the way to correct heresy is to redress the balance of orthodoxy. Jesus certainly did not spiritualize the common, pitiable, disabling, loathsome diseases of the people around Him: He healed them. It will be time enough for us to spiritualize His words when we have learned how to spiritualize cancer. Jesus' vision of the Kingdom soared to the heavens where it was laid up for men in the heart of the Father, but He kept that vision always in closest touch with the hard facts of human life.

It is very striking to notice how modern politics is concerning itself, either directly or indirectly, with physical health. The area of human ills with which politics now seeks to deal is a very wide one, but those ills all alike reflect themselves sooner or later in the health

of men, women, and children. Ill-health is still the invariable sign that something is seriously wrong not only with the individual organism, but with the body politic. "What's wrong with the poor" may be their poverty, but one almost inevitable consequence of their poverty is that familiarity with the "Infirmary", which is such a monotonous feature of the life of the poor. It is rare to find a poor home in which some member of the family is not an out-patient at a hospital, or in which some other member has not had a long spell of treatment in some such institution. There is no ill in the body politic, whether social, economic, or industrial, which does not "light up" at last in the physical ill-health of some member of society.

It is not difficult to trace how modern politics in all the wide ramifications of its task is caring ultimately for bodily health. Bad housing is the very breeding-ground of "all manner of disease and all manner of sickness". Employment and the conditions of work, wages and their economic adequacy, the price of food and its quality, pensions and insurance, the land and its accessibility, temperance and prohibition, all these are matters which bear directly on physical health and disease; and they are the raw material of our politics. Education dispels the ignorance which fosters the personal habits and social customs from which ill-health springs, and is thus an agency of the light which banishes disease. The connexion between war and a whole skin, both before and after the battle, need not be elaborated.

The democratization of politics has meant increasingly that it has concerned itself less with the dynasties of kings and more with the physical well-being of the common people. Modern politics thus tends to go hand in hand with the Gospel on one side and with medicine on the other. It is assuming the burden of the Gospel's programme of healing and carrying it in co-operation with modern medicine. The indebtedness of medicine itself to the Gospel sympathy and the Gospel values is so complete as to make it the very child of the Gospel. The native place of the medical art, as we know it, is Capernaum. "A new teaching" amazed that Galilean city, and from it Western medicine has arisen. Unwearying compassion for the sick, uncompromising hostility towards the causes of disease, undiscriminating benevolence of the healing touch, the utter serviceableness of its power for all and sundry, and an underlying faith that "God wills health", these were the elements of the new doctrine and the new practice, and they inspired a new medicine.

Recently there has been a change in the method of medicine which will have much significance for politics. It is seeking prevention rather than cure, and some of its leading exponents declare that this will be the line of its future development. It will

not guarantee "cures" but will concern itself with the preservation of health. Yet the more medicine presses for the establishment of the necessary conditions of health, the closer it will be drawn towards politics as practised to-day. If, for example, instead of seeking abstruse cures for tuberculosis, medicine insists upon a plentiful supply of fresh pure milk, in order to prevent the disease from arising, it will have to demand further legislation for the inspection of farms and perhaps for the re-organization of the railways. As this process continues it may at last be seen that politics is the true medicine.

The Gospel and politics are thus drawing together, as the Gospel lends hope and inspiration to politics, and politics undertakes the practical task of setting up the conditions of physical health. This approximation of the one to the other cannot be lamented as the secularization of the Gospel. In the mind of Jesus the connexion between the proclaiming of the Gospel and the healing of the sick was a profound and vital one. He regarded the restoration of the sick and disabled to health as a positive evidence of the power and actual presence of the Kingdom : "If I by the finger of God cast out devils, then is the Kingdom of God come upon you". The healing of the sick was a proof not only of the possibility and proximity of the Kingdom, but of its actual arrival. That active finger of God is manifesting itself to-day in our swift sympathy with the sick; in the generous response to their needs which is a characteristic grace of our generation; in our curious impatience and indignation with the causes of ill-health, as though we feel, like Jesus, that the devil is lurking there; in our unceasing search for what those causes are; and in the devotion shown in the treatment and nursing of the sick. We can take heart in believing that through all these activities the Kingdom of God is truly coming in.

Whenever the Gospel is preached with its original sympathy and fervour, the work of healing accompanies it or follows quickly in its wake. The most evident example of this association of preaching and healing in our day is the medical work of our Missionary Societies. Where the missionary goes the hospital and the school soon follow. The missionary has no option in the matter : no option is left him either by the needs of those to whom he preaches or by the terms of his own commission. He must heal the sick both because no one else is doing so, and because Jesus bade him. Our missionary societies are being criticized in some quarters for this practical side of their work, on the ground, once again, that it is secularizing the Gospel. But the hospital, and the school which is almost part of the hospital as light is a primary condition of health, is no mere accessory of the Gospel. It is the expression of the Gospel on its practical side, and its necessity is laid upon those who would be its apostles

as definitely and as authoritatively as the proclaiming of the Good News. This inevitable connexion between the two expressions of the Gospel, which goes back to the mind, practice, and commission of Jesus Himself, is the all-sufficient defence which the missionary needs against this *un*evangelical criticism.

This empty charge of secularizing the Gospel may bring us to the end of this article. The merging of the Gospel in the work of politics, until the inspiration of the one and the tasks of the other are absorbed in one another, may remind us that the revealed end of the Gospel is a city—a city of God. Such a city, like any other, must have its politics, but its politics will be "all Gospel". Superficially that city may appear to some eyes disconcertingly secularized and many may wonder whether it really is the city for which they looked. For there will be seen "no temple therein". Nevertheless, the city will be not godless but holy, because in it politics and the Gospel will have become indistinguishable. It will be a city so charged with the light and power of the love of God that the very leaves which breathe on its countless trees will be full of healing for the people, and their fragrance will provide the only medicine needed.

CLAUD M. COLTMAN.

A LAYMAN'S VIEW OF PREACHING.[1]

I am sure that I do not speak for myself alone, but express the opinion of a vast multitude of laymen, when I say that preaching is a great and noble vocation and when I congratulate you that you are to practise it. Upon this topic it is not necessary for me to enlarge before this audience. You would not be preparing yourselves for the work of the Christian ministry if you had not already said to yourselves and felt within yourselves all and more than all that I could say upon it. In a great and stimulating book, which I would commend with all my heart to any of you who do not already know it, you will find these words:

> No inducement would have led him to abandon his work as a Christian minister—in his mind the noblest calling open to man, demanding and exercising his highest powers. He would have regarded the Government bench itself as a descent from the pulpit of Carrs Lane.

You will find those words in the *Life of R. W. Dale,* a biography which is praised highly indeed and yet no more than it deserves when I say that it is worthy of its theme, one of those books for which a man might well be ready to sell his shirt. I bought my own copy over twenty years ago, but about a year since I picked up a copy second-hand for threepence from a provincial bookseller, who told me that it had come to him with a large number of theological works from a minister. "You see, sir", he said, "he was weeding out his library". A felt sorry for that minister, infinitely sorry if he was driven to the sale by poverty, and sorrier still if he sold that book without the justification of that excuse. It is one of the books which from cover to cover inspire you with a sense of the high calling of the Christian preacher. But do not imagine that the exalted view, the exalted and yet absolutely just view, or rather the exalted and *therefore* absolutely just view, which Dr. Dale took of the preacher's office, is held only by ministers themselves. You will find it shared by many in your audiences. By the mercy of God you may so labour and so preach that, before your work amongst them is finished, it will be held as an irrefutable axiom by the whole of your congregation.

It is true that there is no higher vocation than preaching. It is also true that there is no more difficult art. This second truth is not perhaps so generally recognized as the first, yet it is so true that it ought almost to be a platitude. It is not easy to attain success in any kind of public speaking; I doubt whether you would be able to find an instance of any great master of that art whose

1 An address to the students of Regent's Park Baptist College, London, and Oxford.

triumphs had been achieved without long and patient preparation. I had thought that the great Lord Chatham was an example of an orator of the highest rank who owed little or nothing to self-imposed training and discipline. But I read in Lord Rosebery's study of him that to improve his diction

> he had twice read through Bailey's Dictionary and had *plodded* through masses of sermons (" plodded "—perhaps Lord Chatham and Lord Rosebery had no particular predilection for sermons), particularly those of Barrow, Abernethy, and the late Mr. Mudge of Plymouth.

Despite all his natural genius, that was the price which he had to pay before he attained to his supremacy in debate. As soon as you aim above the most mediocre standard, all forms of public speaking are arduous and exacting, and none more so than preaching. The man who composes and preaches a fine sermon achieves a great work of art. For consider what he undertakes and performs. He cannot succeed without some degree of verbal felicity. He must have at his command apt and expressive words, and he is dealing with topics in which the right or the expressive word is not often found at the tip of the tongue or the pen, but has to be laboriously sought and pursued. Then he is not engaged merely in stating and refuting the contention of a scholarly adversary or in expounding or criticizing some theological or philosophical thesis. These are tasks which will come his way, and even for the satisfactory accomplishment of them rare gifts are required in the use of language, the arrangement of ideas, and the marshalling of arguments. But he has to go further still. He must lift men to a view of things which is not within the ordinary compass of their thoughts. He has to withdraw the veil from their eyes, so that for the time they are delivered from the restrictions and the prejudices of their ordinary habits of mind and the pressure of this passing show of time and sense and, contemplating themselves and their activities *sub specie eternitatis*, " look not at the things which are seen but at the things which are not seen". He must penetrate into the very deeps of their souls, and yet almost at every step of the way he is liable to find the passage denied to him. To be allowed to enter into those ultimate recesses and to touch those most intimate and sacred springs of feeling and resolve is the highest privilege which any speaker can ask of his hearers. It is not readily granted, and, even if it has been granted, it may be quickly withdrawn. Let the preacher grasp too roughly at men's heart-strings, or, on the other hand, let there be only a hint of sickliness of sentiment in his words or his manner or his voice, let his touch be too familiar or, on the other hand, let it be too timid, let his tread be too assured or, on the contrary, let it stumble and falter—and the right of way is cancelled at once, and not *this* morning, not *this* evening, will he be able to

strike home to the central fortress of the personality. He fails, if he does not stir the emotions and the will, and yet there are stimulants and methods which may be permitted to other speakers but must be eschewed by him. He dare not appeal to a conviction, if he believes it to be an unjustifiable prejudice. He must be scrupulously honest in all that he says and in all that he omits, because the servant of Christ cannot play fast and loose with truth, and yet such honesty has led before now to misunderstanding and hostility. He must deny himself the popular and the captivating phrase, which would not rightly express his thought. He must scorn the cheap and easy effects which sound incongruous upon the lips of one who bears the most solemn of all messages, and yet he must not lose touch with his audience. He must be authoritative without ceasing to be humble. He must be direct and yet discreet. He must be plain and outspoken without a hint of self-sufficiency or presumption. He must not lack a touch of austerity, and yet it must be plain that his breast harbours every sympathy which is quickened by noble love or righteous indignation, by pity or by courage, or by any of the loftier qualities of man.

Any human production in which you must command such a combination of faculties for supreme success belongs clearly to a high realm of art. I do not know how far the great preachers have regarded themselves as artists, but when I read the finest sermons of (let us say) Bossuet or Cardinal Newman or Dr. McLaren (and this is not an exhaustive list) I have no more doubt about the art than about the fervour of them. Any preacher might well deplore that in the short span of human life there is no time to master all the secrets or to explore all the resources of his craft. I have heard this saying attributed to Dr. Parker of the City Temple: "It took me twenty years to learn how to preach a sermon in twenty minutes". In so arduous and sublime an art even natural genius must serve a long apprenticeship and botch many a piece of promising work before it attains to true excellence.

I hope that in this somewhat formidable array of antitheses I have said nothing to suggest that I wish to hear fine preaching in the sense of a deliberate display of pulpit gifts. Nothing could be more painful, incongruous, or discreditable. That style of thing would bear as much resemblance to the kind of preaching which I am trying to describe as the coloured lights and the explosives of some set piece of fireworks bear to the silent splendours of the dawn or the evening sky. Such a vulgar parade of ability would antagonize every right-minded man. I am not denouncing that fault, for the simple reason that I have never found a preacher who was guilty of it. I am sure that it would be both unnecessary and impertinent to commend to you the mingled wisdom and humility of the answer of John Bunyan

to someone who told him that he had preached a good sermon : "The Devil told me that before you did". But at the same time it is well to remember the remark attributed, rightly or wrongly, to Mr. Spurgeon—do not neglect his lectures to his students—that, whilst the Bible teaches us that "it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe", it nowhere asserts that God has promised to use foolish preaching to the same end. The distinction is surely as just as it is witty.

I am sure that the preacher is right deliberately to cultivate every literary grace and device which can add to the force or the beauty of his language, and he cannot go wrong so long as he is only concerned to speed the arrow of his message to the conscience of his hearers. Whilst that remains his only object, he will keep all metaphors and ornaments and all the apparatus of his literary craftsmanship in their proper place.

Each of you will have to discover and to develop for himself the methods of work and of composition which are best suited to his cast of mind and temperament, and you will no doubt have to drive yourself at times, when inspiration, invention, and imagination alike seem to droop and to flag and you seem incapable of putting two ideas together. But no time will be lost which you spend in giving to your thoughts the most perfect and expressive form which lies within your power, in hunting for the right epithet, in untying the various strands of an episode in order that you may present it attractively and forcibly, in clarifying and sharpening some conception which reigns powerfully but vaguely in your mind so that you may present it in bold, powerful, and convincing strokes to your congregation, or in re-arranging the order of your topics so that they may unfold themselves in your discourse with a more natural and a more persuasive development. Work tells in all these matters, hard, relentless work, which keeps you at the full stretch of your powers and will take no denial, the work of which Virgil wrote, "*labor improbus omnia vincit*". Dr. Alexander Whyte in his seventieth year wrote as follows :

> I wrote my last forenoon sermon three times over. And that is the only thing in which I resemble Newman. He wrote *all* his sermons as often as I wrote mine last week.

How innumerable are the problems of composition. Oh, the difficulty of making a speech or a sermon cohere and move and expand as if it had a life of its own and grew by a natural process from exordium to conclusion ! This gift of developing a subject seems to be inexplicable even by those who display it most felicitously. When it is so displayed, it conceals itself by its very perfection. It looks as if it happened all by itself and could not have happened otherwise. But it did not happen by itself. Ask the masters who

have wrought that miracle in literature or in music, as in Wordsworth's great ode, or in the Waldstein sonata of Beethoven, and you will find that the effect of spontaneous and inevitable self-development through theme to theme, from strophe to strophe, was as a rule the outcome of endless and laborious trial and rejection, ruthless elimination of much that had been evolved with great care and labour, and then was seen to be less successful than it promised. I do not suppose that the minister who is faithful in the discharge of all his duties will have the time to devote to his sermons which the great artists have been able to give to the construction of their masterpieces in music or painting or literature. But the spirit in which they worked should animate him in his study. He should strive for effect as honestly and as honourably as they. Dr. Johnson tells us of the vast pains which Samuel Butler took in the composition of his *Hudibras,* almost writing it out first in prose and collecting assiduously in a commonplace book—I cannot resist quoting this bit of Johnsonese—

> such remarks, similitudes, allusions, assemblages, or inferences as occasion prompted or meditation produced,

and then Dr. Johnson adds in conclusion :

> Such is the labour of those who write for immortality.

Shall the labour of those who preach the tidings of immortal salvation be any less?

Form and expression are important. But there is something even more important, about which I think we shall all agree; I mean that your message should have passed through the crucible of your own imagination, and should come forth from that heat and stress with something upon it of the stamp of your own unique individuality. For, if you use your own imagination, you will talk in your own tongue and not be the blurred echo of the voice of another. When I refer to the imagination here, I am not thinking of the faculty of discovering unsuspected relations between things and startling analogies, of the fountain of bright fancies and sparkling conceits, but of the meditative, inventive faculty, which does for the living but undeveloped idea what the hen does for the embryonic chicken in the egg. It is the faculty of brooding upon some conception until it begins to take shape and colour, to spring up and to dilate, to put forth signs of life on this hand and on that, and so to clothe itself in words and images and trains of thought, which are as truly expressive of its real nature as the human face and body are expressive of the human personality which informs them. Take this faculty at its highest and widest and deepest and you are in the region of the greatest writers of poetry or prose, and in that region the preacher will do well to keep a permanent domicile. Regular commerce with those writers will be of incalculable advantage to him.

It will encourage a habit of mind in which sentimentality withers, but lofty sentiment, wide sympathy, and deep tenderness flourish and expand. It will nourish the sense of beauty in healthy union with the sense of moral worth. It will quicken all the functions of heart and mind, and that interplay between them, that illumination of the one by the other, without which the best preaching is unattainable, and above all it will stimulate that faculty of imagination, about which I am now speaking.

The exercise of such a faculty must, of course, be arduous. Even the greatest poets have not commanded it at will. There have been times when they could not mount this Pegasus or found him unresponsive to the touch of hand or knee or spur. In those most charming and touching of diaries, the *Journals of Dorothy Wordsworth*, you find such references as these to the work of her brother William, the poet. Let me quote a few, which all fall within the period Wednesday, 15th October, to Wednesday, 29th October, 1800:

> Wedn. 15.—William composed at the sheepfold after dinner.
>
> Sat. 18.—William worked all the morning at the sheepfold, but in vain.
>
> Mond. 20th.—William worked in the morning at the sheepfold.
>
> Tues. 21st.—William had been unsuccessful in the morning at the sheepfold.
>
> Wedn. 22nd.—William composed without much success at the sheepfold.
>
> Thurs. 23rd.—William was not successful in composition in the evening.
>
> Frid. 24th.—We walked, before William began to work, to the top of the Rydale hill. He was afterwards only partly successful in composition.
>
> Sat. 25th.—William again unsuccessful.
>
> Sunday.—William composed a good deal in the morning.
>
> Mond. 27th.—William could not compose much. Fatigued himself with altering.

(Don't you have a fellow-feeling with him there in his wearisome but vain attempts to bring something in words a little nearer to the notion of it which flits about in his mind?)

> Wedn. 29 Oct.—William worked at his poem all the morning.

At times even the great artists in poetry and in prose can only gather the wood and heap up the sacrifice and then wait until the fire falls from heaven. But to reward them for these periods of drudgery they have their times of inspiration, when thought leads on to thought in beautiful and harmonious progression and the right words come tripping to the mind in an easy and abundant stream.

Perhaps you feel that this is not the kindest or the most comforting doctrine to set before men who must produce two masterpieces a week by the clock to be delivered punctually every Sunday morning and evening. But as it is no use to pretend that we are always

in the vein for the best work, whatever it may be, of which we are individually capable, so it is encouraging to know that the steady and laborious cultivation and exercise of the imaginative or any other faculty, sometimes without much immediate result, has been the lot of some of the greatest and truest workmen and artists. Do not despair, then, in your cultivation of the faculty of imagination. It may be a barren soil at times, but it will have its seasons of fertility if you persevere, and perhaps they are not obtainable on other terms. It is possible, too, that when the sermon for next Sunday seems obstinately to remain a heap of painfully accumulated wood, upon which no fire falls to set it in a blaze, you may be judging it too harshly. It may be better than you think, and the fire may fall at the very last minute. I add this for your consolation, but I beseech you not to be ready to avail yourselves of it.

Let the example, then, of the great imaginative artists encourage you. Let their works delight and exalt you and stimulate this life-giving, imaginative capacity in you. John Bright steeped himself in Milton. Alexander Whyte was a great student of Dante. Both men thus prepared and sustained themselves in their great task of moral exhortation, and you, who are addressing yourselves to the same task, will be wise to refresh and to nourish yourselves at the same fountains and pastures. We have great poetry enough in English for your wants, and great hymns too, from which you will derive inspiration and strength. May I also suggest that, if your time permits, you should gain and preserve such mastery of the noble Latin tongue as will give you entrance at will to the splendour and tenderness of Virgil and to the austere and yet human majesty of the disciple whom Virgil guided on his poetic way, the high-souled, the immortal Dante? All these are mighty names. They have mighty gifts to impart to the sympathetic mind. But do not be discouraged if time fails you for the study of them all.

For your purposes there is a book more important than anything that even the greatest poets have written, a book for the constant study of which you will find time, whatever other books you may have to neglect. The Bible is still your incomparable and inexhaustible armoury. Whether you consider its narratives, its teaching, its humanity, its sublimity, or in our English version its beauty of language like the strength and freshness of a day in an English June, it is a book by itself. You have in it the very accents of the Divine Wisdom which taught and spoke in and through the life and the lips of our Lord, and the authentic words of those who received from Him the mighty mission of the Apostolate. Could there be for you or for anyone a nobler or a loftier exercise of the imaginative faculty than to apply it to the writings of St. John, so crystalline in their clearness, yet so unsearchable in their depth?

Meditate in the Bible *and quote* from it. Whilst I was putting together these remarks I returned more than once to the sermons of Newman and Whyte and McLaren. Those men knew their poets and profited by the study of them, yet rarely quote from them. But how often they quote from the Bible, often quotation upon quotation on the same page, and in Newman at times a page which is almost made up of Biblical quotations. These men knew their Bible, and—pardon the apparent irreverence of the phrase—they knew their trade and could handle their tools like true craftsmen. You will find that their quotations set bells ringing down the passages of your memory. You will find too sometimes that they can use a Biblical quotation, perhaps only three or four words, so that it not only illuminates the train of thought which has led up to it, but is itself presented to the hearer in such a way that it is perhaps then seen by him for the first time in its true significance, as a skilful jeweller will place some rare stone at the exact spot in a cluster where it sets off the lesser jewels around it and they at the same time, by the contrast of their lights and colours, bring out all the hidden beauties of its glow and lustre. Of course there are other ways of quoting, as *e.g.*, the way of the worthy, old-fashioned Baptist deacon, who, quoting one text more or less apposite, would then run on, as if he could not control his tongue when once it was started on the beloved words, and quote the next half dozen texts as well, and even then would stop rather from want of breath than from any sense of their comparative irrelevance to the matter in hand. I could still listen to that method of quotation without annoyance, as no doubt you could too, for the sake of some men, objects to me of reverent and grateful recollection, who used and delighted in it, but I am not commending it to you. I think I am right in saying that ministers quote the Bible less than they did. I am sure that I speak for the pew when I exhort them to return to the older practice. Learn to quote from the Bible, to quote effectively, "rightly dividing the Word of Truth" after the pattern of such men as I have mentioned, and you will both please and help us.

I doubt whether it is profitable to discuss whether a man should read his sermon or should deliver it more or less extemporary. I am sure that all men, or nearly all men, are the better for writing out fully the sermon or the speech which they propose to deliver. It is certainly better that some should desert their manuscript when they face their audience. It is equally certain that it is better that some *should not*. Each man must find out for himself to which class he belongs, and, if he cannot find it out by himself, he will soon discover it from his wife or from some other kindly, yet candid, critic. But, if you read your sermon or recite a sermon which you have written

and memorized, let your style be adapted to the occasion. Remember that you are speaking to an audience, not writing for a reader, and so avoid phrases which are too highly packed in meaning or too recondite in allusion for a listener. For most people are able to concentrate more intently upon what they read than upon what they hear.

Do not be misled by cleverness or timidity or any other motive into trying to find props for the Gospel. Preach the Gospel *boldly* as it was preached by St. Paul, as the power of God, as the self-revelation of God, which carries its own witness and confirmation to those who accept and believe it. You have no quarrel with science. You have no need to break a lance with scientific theories. They are great and glorious in their sphere, but the Gospel was not built upon them and is not commended to men or proved by them. The Gospel has its sanctions, as they have theirs. It is well, therefore, to cross-examine oneself sternly about the use of phrases which may belong to the current phraseology of the philosophical or even the theological schools. The preacher who is ill-advised enough so to use such phrases that he seems to be blind or only half-informed as to the controversies and theories behind them, imperils at once his standing in the minds of some of his hearers, whilst the remainder are more likely to be puzzled than impressed. I may illustrate my meaning by a reference to current developments in scientific and philosophical theory. The old antagonism between religion and science is certainly being softened, if not quite outgrown, as science sheds more and more of the crude materialism of its former pre-suppositions. Science now tends to affirm the reality of a spiritual world. You may hear this trend in current speculation hailed in conversation and perhaps even in the pulpit as indicating that modern research and modern thought by their own processes and discoveries are driving men to belief in the God Whom as revealed in our Lord Jesus Christ you will be commissioned to preach. I cannot and I do not pretend to any great acquaintance with these studies, but yet I have a feeling, not (I think) a mistaken feeling, that any such conclusion would not commend itself to the true scientist or philosopher, and would be attributed by him to ignorance. For I suspect that when he has explained to you all that he means and intends to concede by his doctrine of the reality of the spiritual world, you will not find in it any equivalent or substitute for the Christian motive, which alone has led men throughout the centuries to embrace the Christian faith in God, to follow the Son of God as their Master, and to trust only in Him for salvation. It cannot supply, and it does not pretend to supply, that hope of salvation which is in Jesus Christ. It plainly neither confirms nor replaces the Christian doctrines, *e.g.*, of Atonement and Redemption, which are the very foundation of the Christian life, hope, and

courage. It does not explain away and it does not take the place of the experience and the inspiration which speak out plainly in such texts as "The love of Christ constraineth us", or again, " I live, yet not I, but Christ who liveth in me". When you read texts such as those, you are in a realm far removed, nay, totally different in quality and nature, from that spiritual world in which, according to modern thought, reality is to be found. Modern science may discard the outworn fallacies of a materialism which in fact had never been able to reply to the criticisms of Berkeley and of Hume, but it is true still that spiritual truths by which the Christian holds and lives are spiritually discerned. To those who perish (as the familiar words express it) they may be foolishness, but to those who are being saved they carry their own credentials. I do not suppose that anyone has explained, or ever will explain, how men are brought to Christ, but two things are certain, the one, that men are brought to Him, and the other, that scientific hypothesis or demonstration can never do the work of the Holy Spirit. Call upon men and women to come to Christ not on the ground that He is being vindicated by modern science, but on the ground that those who come will not be cast out and will find in Him the peace, the hope, the salvation, which He promises. An ambassador should not fear to present his message upon the sole authority of his Sovereign. "Christ, I am Christ's, and let the name suffice you" is the cry which befits the ambassador of Christ. It is also the cry which strikes home to the human heart. I am not urging now that the preacher should be an obscurantist, indifferent to the scope and purport of modern speculation or forgetful that in its reverent study of the world it reaches, in its own kind and degree, to some revelation of Him Who made the world. Nothing is further from my intention. By all means teach men to value and to reverence true learning. They are not apt to overrate it. But still bear in mind the old Pauline contrast, "not in learning, but in power". Let it be plain that you believe in Christ as One Who taught with divine authority. Handle and expound the words of Christ as being the words of life, of living truth. Preach the Gospel as being a Gospel of power which will justify and manifest itself in life. Let the preacher do this and he will build up the faith of his people and will build it upon the only sure foundation.

But he must be *sincere*. He must say what he himself knows to be true with a conviction and a certainty which reach far deeper and far higher than any merely intellectual assent. I fancy that a good many church-goers wonder why they hear so little from the pulpit about Christian doctrine, and perhaps wonder, too, whether it is because the preacher, with an honesty which does him credit, prefers not to preach on matters which he does not feel to be wrought into the very fabric of his own spiritual life. I do not think that there

is any demand for what I may call the theological essay in the pulpit. If it were well done, I think I should myself be quite prepared to listen appreciatively to a treatise, mis-named a sermon, on the history of some Christian dogma and on the formulation of it by Councils or by Fathers of the Church, but I doubt whether my taste for such a discourse is very widely shared, and I certainly would not think the worse of anyone for not sharing it. But at the same time I think it is very doubtful whether preaching can reach its full strength and effect if it is wholly divorced from doctrine. Such preaching is exposed to many kinds of weakness and extravagance. It may lapse imperceptibly into a gentle essay on conduct, which would not in spirit have been out of place amongst the meditations of Marcus Aurelius or the kindly moralizings of Robert Louis Stevenson or Charles Lamb. It may dwindle into a tinkling and sentimental prettiness or titillate the fancy by picturesque and over-wrought language. It may be a marvel of skill and grace, exquisitely worded and delightfully light in touch. But it will not be the sermon which you want to preach and we want to hear, and, when you preach that sermon, I think there will be a substantial admixture of Christian doctrine in it, not mere theology, but doctrine which, as it came out of the experience of the Christian Church, so has been experimentally and imaginatively apprehended by you in your turn and bears upon it some impress of your own personality. You will not be carrying water from the fountains of others, but you will yourself be smiting open a spring in the rock. In that sense it seems to me that many of the great preachers, even of modern times, have been doctrinal preachers. If you went back to the sermons of the eighteenth century you would find in them, of course, a vast—to us at times an almost tedious—amount of doctrine. If I remember rightly, Mr. Spurgeon preached a good deal of doctrine to his vast audiences. You will find much of it too in the sermons of Canon Liddon and Cardinal Newman. But I am referring to more recent preachers. At the very end of his career Dr. McLaren chose as his text the familiar words of *John* 3^{16}, and preached upon them a sermon which seemed to me, when I read it, to display plainly the marks of a great masterpiece. But if you will look at it you will find that throughout, if I may so put it, it implies and suggests Christian doctrines. It could only have been preached by a man into whose real life those doctrines had entered as iron may enter the blood or as the true principles of an art build themselves up in the true artist and inform and express themselves in his work. You have only to penetrate a little way below the surface of such a sermon and you find the doctrine, not a dead frame-work of scaffolding, but a living part of the living power of the preacher's word and life. I have never heard a sermon on the doctrine of Imputed Righteousness, or, if I have, it was so long ago in my boyhood that I have forgotten it. But I can conceive a man

who under the pressure of a sense of sin should feel that there could be no hope for him unless the righteousness of his sinless Redeemer were in some way, uncomprehended and perhaps unintelligible, imparted to him, and I can conceive that man under the impulse of his experience so preaching that doctrine that it would stir and win the hearts of others. But he would only do that if he preached it from his heart. This, I suppose, is what Dr. Denney means when he says, I think it is in his *Letters*—buy that book if ever you see it on a second-hand bookstall—that sometimes the man on a soap-box at the street corner knows more about Pauline doctrine than some learned German critic, and the same may be true of critics of other nationalities. The critic analyzed the doctrine, but the speaker at the street corner felt it. The critic wrote of what he had studied; the speaker at the street corner spoke of what he had lived. You remember the motto of Cardinal Newman, *Cor ad cor loquitur:* It is the heart which speaks to the heart. There is no mistaking the difference in tone and weight and appeal of utterance between the preacher who proclaims truths out of a textbook and the preacher who proclaims them out of his own life. To base one's own life firm and sure upon the truths of the Christian Gospel, to test them and to prove them more and more fully, to brood and to meditate upon them with a reverent and a sympathetic imagination, that no doubt is what we should all try to do. But, oh, if *you* can compass that and then can speak of them out of the fullness of *your* experience, your voice will have in it the note of authority and of sincerity which wins both attention and assent. Men will listen to your message. For it will be the outpouring of your heart, not the mere product of much cudgelling of your brain.

Whilst I was laboriously putting together this address, I refrained from reading again Dr. Phillips Brooks's *Lectures on Preaching,* because, as I was taught at school when I did Latin prose, it is advisable, if you want to produce your own version, not to begin by reading the version of some great scholar. But I have turned to the Bishop's lectures for one illustration, which will emphasize my present point. He says this:

> Among the many sermons I have heard, I always remember one. It was a sermon by Mr. George MacDonald, the English author, and it had many of the good and bad characteristics of his interesting style. . . . But over and through it all it had this quality: it was a message from God to these people by him. The man struggled with language as a child struggles with his imperfectly mastered tongue, that will not tell the errand as he received it and has it in his mind. As I listened, I seemed to see how weak in contrast was the way in which other preachers had amused me and challenged my admiration for the working of their minds. Here was a gospel. Here were real tidings. And you listened and forgot the preacher.

"You listened and forgot the preacher". I have been trying to tell you what one layman, not, I hope, unrepresentative of others, would like to hear from you in the pulpit, and yet those six simple words perhaps express the whole of the ideal which your audience would wish you to keep before your eyes. "You listened and forgot the preacher". The attention of the audience was gained and held. They were led, not because they were conscientious and obedient sheep who would not dream of straying or rebelling, but because some power kept them fast and led them *captive*. But what did it? Not the eloquence of the orator, not the craftsmanship of the stylist, *but the message of the man*. On those terms, gentlemen, I presume that you would all be content that your audience should forget you. I hope that you have already been fortunate enough to hear one or two sermons of that kind, and that your congregations will be fortunate enough to hear many such sermons from your lips. I have thought at times that much the same effect is produced upon us by the very finest of our hymns. Take, for example, the classic hymn by John Newton, " How sweet the name of Jesus sounds". I am prepared to maintain against all comers that it is a composition of the highest merit as regards literary quality, a very notable example of that strong, manly, direct diction of the eighteenth century. But it is so great a hymn that its literary excellence is forgotten and is only realized on second thoughts. We are impressed primarily and mainly by the burning, passionate sincerity of the writer. We know at once that he is pouring out his heart, and the amazing vigour and spontaneity of the hymn could never have been achieved if he had not been writing about the very springs and secrets of his own life. Even on the printed page the words come at us with the invincible force of a cry, a message, an invocation which a man has uttered because he could not suppress it. In what a sustained sweep of exalted emotion it rises from its opening words to the great accumulation of attributes in the fourth verse, "Jesus! My Shepherd, Brother, Friend", and so on. When a man writes or speaks in that way, there is no question whether men will listen to him or not. They must listen. They cannot help listening. Sometimes in a sermon, which is in the other parts of it not very arresting or inspiring, there will come a moment when the message begins to replace the man, and the difference which at once enters into the quality of the preaching *and the listening* is unmistakeable.

For this result, several conditions must be satisfied. The preacher, as I have already said, must be absolutely sincere. He may have difficulties with his language, but they must not arise from any attempt to say either less or more than he most profoundly knows and believes. He must be humble. He must be emptied of self. He must be careless of any such things as fame or applause. He

must himself be possessed by a truth, and he must labour simply to convey it to others without any loss in transmission of the beauty, the intensity, the brightness, with which it attracts and dominates his own mind. He must be animated by that same carelessness of self in comparison with a great and an inspiring Cause, which rings so eloquently and so impressively in the great outburst of Danton, *Que mon nom soit flétrie, que la France soit sauvée.* Perish my name, providing France be saved. All these things are necessary. But, let me repeat, this is even more necessary. His message must be a realized, an experienced, and therefore a vital message, with which he tingles, so to speak, from crown to foot. Let this be lacking and he must be platitudinous. For, as Sir Walter Raleigh used to say, a platitude is only a truth spoken by someone who has not felt it. But let him speak out of his own living experience, and he will not be platitudinous, although he may say nothing new. He may handle commonplaces, but his handling of them will be vital and vivifying. The biographer of that modern saint, Bishop Hannington, records this of him:

> Whatever faults he may have had, preaching beyond his own experience was not one of them. Whether or no he had read old John Byrom's advice to preachers, he so far followed it that
>
> he never dealt
> In the false commerce of a truth unfelt.
>
> In this lay much of the power of his preaching. He proclaimed what he knew.

John Bunyan expressed the same idea in a well-known passage, "I preached what I felt, what I smartingly did feel". Whatever else our future preachers may learn—and *forget*, let them learn and REMEMBER that. If you will practise those principles, gentlemen, you will find us very ready to listen to you.

It is time to bring this address to an end. It has already detained you too long from your homes and your holidays. I have told you that your hearers, for whom I speak, know that you are engaged in an arduous and a glorious calling. Let a high courage hold a leading place in the equipment with which you embark upon it, both for your work in the pulpit and (to stray a moment beyond my subject) for your work out of the pulpit as well. There are times when a doctor has to risk his popularity with his patient for the very sake of making his patient well. We prefer doctors who take the risk. You may have to risk the popularity which you have legitimately won in obedience to your loyalty to truth. If you should be confronted with that choice, fear not the face of man. There is no reason, for that matter, why you or anyone should fear that gregarious and distracted biped, and yet, because we are gregarious creatures, when such a choice is before us, it is often as hard definitely to commit ourselves to the right alternative as it

is easy to recognize it. But do not hesitate. Take the risk. Our taste in ministers here is like our taste in doctors. We prefer the minister who takes the risk, and we trust, respect, and love him all the more for it in the end. Be assured that in his heart of hearts the man in the pew wants the man in the pulpit to fear God *and to fear no one else*. One of the greatest men in the ranks of the greatest preachers, whose courage was always beyond question, gave us the secret of it in these words, "Wherefore we labour, that, whether present or absent, we may be *accepted of Him* . . . For the love of Christ constraineth us". Aspire to emulate St. Paul in his courage. Aspire, too, to burn with his passion for the salvation of men, of which F. W. H. Myers wrote in the familiar words:

> What was their sweet desire and subtle yearning,
> Lovers, and women whom their song enrols?
> Faint to the flame which in my breast is burning,
> Less than the love wherewith I *ache for souls*.

Exercising your vocation in this apostolic mood and according to this apostolic example, you will be recompensed by the same apostolic reward, "by manifestation of the truth commending (y)ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God". So, thanking you for your patience, I wish you the utmost and the truest success both in your preaching and in all your ministerial labours, and I bid you God speed.

C. T. Le Quesne.

THE HUSBAND OF LUCREZIA DEL SARTO, 1486—1530.

THIS year sees the four hundredth anniversary of the death of Andrea del Sarto, and since 1930 has brought unrivalled opportunities for the study of Italian art, there is a special interest in looking back upon his chequered career.

It is in the *Via Gino del Capponi,* the Florentine street leading out of the *Piazza Santa Annunziata,* that the house stands to which Andrea brought his bride in the year 1512. Since it is now in private occupation this house of memories is closed to the sight-seer; but to those who have been privileged to enter it the artist "*senza errori*" is not only an artist, he is—as he was to Browning—the husband of Lucrezia. There in the window of that upper room they sat, no hindering forest of roofs and chimneys then to block out the view of distant Fiesole; her hand in his, her head upon his shoulder, his caressing, beseeching voice in her ear.

> My serpentining beauty, rounds on rounds!
> How could you ever prick those perfect ears
> Even to put the pearls there! Oh! so sweet—
> My face, my moon, my everybody's moon,
> Which everybody looks on and calls his,
> And, I suppose, is looked on by in turn,
> While she looks—no one's; very dear, no less.
> You smile? why, there's my picture ready made,
> There's what we painters call our harmony!
> A common greyness silvers everything—
> All in a twilight, you and I alike,
> You at the point of your first pride in me
> (That's gone, you know), but I at every point;
> My youth, my hope, my art, being all toned down
> To yonder sober pleasant Fiesole.

It is an autumn of the soul that has keyed down the values of Andrea's world, autumn in everything, making the whole world for him "a twilight piece"; and this loss of vitality, according to Browning, is the result of Lucrezia's numbing influence:

> But had you, oh! with the same perfect brow,
> And perfect eyes and more than perfect mouth,
> And the low voice my soul hears, as a bird
> The fowler's pipe and follows to the snare—
> Had you, with these the same, but brought a mind!
> Some women do so. Had the mouth there urged,
> "God and the glory, never care for gain;
> The present by the future, what is that?
> Live for fame, side by side with Agnolo!
> Rafael is waiting: up to God all three!"
> I might have done it for you.

How far is this view of the artist and his limitations justified? The inscription on the façade of the house says that the "*pittore senza errori*" died there is in the year 1530 "*pieno di gloria e di domestici affanni*" (full of glory and of domestic sorrows). That he died in misery we know: like Beethoven, he was deserted in his last moments, and like Beethoven he was found by a passer-by, unconscious and alone in a house from which the rest of the inhabitants had fled. There was, however, an excuse in his case that was lacking in that of Beethoven, for his illness was the dreaded *pestilenza*: he was not by any means the only victim to it whose friends escaped lest they should take the infection.

But it is not for Lucrezia's desertion of her husband in death that Browning blames her; it is for failure to satisfy him during his life. And here an interesting point arises, for one of Browning's strongest articles of faith was that lack of satisfaction is one of the best spurs to effort: this belief runs through the whole of his poems and is summed up in the well-known words that he puts into the mouth of Rabbi ben Ezra:

> Then welcome each rebuff
> That turns earth's smoothness rough,
> Each sting that bids nor sit nor stand, but go;
> Be our joys three parts pain,
> Strive, and hold cheap the strain;
> Learn, nor account the pang; dare, never grudge the throe.

Judged by this standard, it was Andrea who was in fault rather than Lucrezia, for he is depicted in the poem as holding "the strain" extremely dear and bearing an eternal grudge against "the throe", instead of rejoicing that the hopes and fears that frayed his flesh thereby

> Brought the invisible full into play.

For all those who know the pictures of the painter whose faultlessness was counted a fault, and especially for those who have learned to know them in the city where he lived and loved, there is deep interest in the question—was this lack in him, which even his contemporaries recognized, due to his own limitations, or is his a case of "the woman Thou gavest me"?

Born on the 16th of July, 1486, he was baptized on the following day, his parents being described in the register as "*Andrea e Domenica d'Agnolo di Francesca, popolo di Santa Maria Novella*". The use of surnames was rare at that time, and since his father was a tailor the boy was generally known as Andrea del Sarto. At the age of seven he was apprenticed to a goldsmith, and while working in the *bottega* his drawings were noticed by Gian Barile, an artist, who offered to teach him. From Barile's studio he passed to that of Piero di Cosimo, and in December, 1508, he was accounted a full-fledged artist and admitted to the *Arte dei Medici*, the Guild which

took its name from the Doctors of Medicine, but in which writers and painters were included. This was the Guild to which Dante was admitted in the year 1295.

The four years that followed were perhaps the happiest of his whole life; with his friend Franciabigio he took a lodging in the *Via della Sapienza,* the street which runs between the *Piazza Santa Annunziata* and the *Piazza San Marco*. The region round about was an Artists' Quarter; painters and sculptors, workers in terra-cotta, in mosaic, in gold and other precious metals, swarmed on every side. They toiled diligently—with results that are the joy of all art lovers to-day—but they also understood the art of amusing themselves. A club to which Andrea and a number of his friends belonged was known as the Kettle Club—the *Accademia del Pajolo*—and was so called from the informal suppers in which the members took "pot-luck". But the club could made a grand show on occasions of ceremony. An account of one such feast has come down to us in which Andrea played a great part. At the cost of infinite pains he made a temple as a centre-piece for the table; in shape an octagon, the columns were formed of sausages, with capitals of cheese carved in exquisite designs; the pavement was made of squares of variously-coloured jellies, the cornices of sugar, the frieze of gaily-dyed sweetmeats. In the middle of the floor stood a pulpit of cooked meat and an altar of pastry, the Service books being made of macaroni with embedded peppercorns to form the notes. Surplices of membrane clothed the birds which represented the choristers, and two fine fat pigeons in beetroot vestments filled the *rôle* of the priests.

Whether the ecclesiastics approved of this elaborate jest history does not relate, but in any case it did not prevent them from employing the young artist, for his frescoes in the *Scalzi* Convent and the Church of the *Santa Annunziata* were commissioned and executed during this period. That his love of jokes and pranks did not interfere with the seriousness of his work is shown by the fact that it was in allusion to his early output that Michelangelo made the remark to Raphael that there was a little man in Florence who, if he had the opportunities that Raphael had in Rome, would make it necessary for him to exert all his force to compete with him—*ti farà sudar la fronte.*

But art was not Andrea's sole preoccupation, nor did the gay society of his boon companions wholly satisfy him. In that same Artists' Quarter lived a hatter, and the hatter had a beautiful wife. Lucrezia del Fede was born in 1490, and while still a very young girl was married to Carlo di Domenico Recanati, who had a shop in the *Via San Gallo*. The *Via Sapienza* was but a stone's throw from the *Piazza San Marco*; one had but to cross it and the *Via San Gallo* stretched before one. Was it surprising that a spirit in the feet of the beauty-loving painter should bear him constantly to her chamber

window? Nor was it only in the feet of Andrea that such a spirit moved: since in that neighbourhood artists were as thick as leaves in Vallombrosa, Lucrezia held a court; she was the fashion, and revelled in knowing herself the fashion; one admirer could be played off against another; the gift of a backward aspirant could be lured from him by exhibiting the gift of another; and thus envy and jealousy could be roused to make the drama more deliciously exciting. All of which was distinctly good from the artistic point of view, and, if the husband had gone on living, neither Browning nor any other critic could have accused Lucrezia of breathing autumn into the painter's soul and thereby enervating his work.

" Some of us in a prior existence have loved an Antigone", said Shelley, "and that makes us find no full content in any mortal tie". The quest of Antigone is a fruitful one; poetry, music, painting and sculpture, all owe to it some of their greatest glories, and so long as it remains a quest it is the inspiration of art, since its supreme sphere is that of the imagination. "What is genius after all ?" says Arsène Houssaye, writing of his friend, Alfred de Musset: " It is but an hour of dizziness on the edge of a precipice. To men who yearn for the Absolute everything is good which drives them out of themselves". It was in Beatrice that Dante found and lost his Antigone, but the loss did not numb his faculties; it drove him out of himself and set him to climb the heights of glory. Not many men of genius, however, are constant as he was: Goethe's quest of Antigone resulted in a series of discoveries followed by a series of disappointments; Colonel Lovelace sang to Althea as well as to Lucasta, and even the timid Cowper hymned responsive to the inspiration of both Lady Austen and Mrs. Unwin.

Such experiences are summed up in the words of Shelley:

> Lamp of Earth ! where'er thou movest
> Its dim shapes are clad with brightness,
> And the souls of whom thou lovest
> Walk upon the winds with lightness,
> Till they fail, as I am failing,
> Dizzy, lost, yet unbewailing.

But though Shelley sought his Antigone in Jane Williams or Emilia Viviani, he was not really "lost" when the quest failed:

> Oh ! Mary dear, that you were here
> With your brown eyes bright and clear !

was the recurring *motif* of his life; in that he rested and in that he was safe; Mary was his real love; the others were but imaginative passions, subjective rather than objective, not so much inspired by the beloved one as projected from the lover's heart and brain.

That Dante was unhappy with Gemma is maintained by those who hold that it is the proper thing for a man who cannot marry his Antigone to find his wedded wife commonplace and boring; but there is

no real evidence that Gemma had any more cause to resent her husband's worship of Beatrice than Mary had to be jealous of Shelley's poetic adorations, or than Mrs. Browning had to think venemously of Browning's many heroines. But though the ideal and the real may be kept apart—in some cases may have finer artistic results when kept apart—there are some lives in which they are united. No one can doubt that Browning found his Antigone and in making her his wife satisfied his inmost soul. Nor can it be questioned that Andrea del Sarto found his Antigone in Lucrezia and in making her his wife struck the knell of his peace; for whether she had a deteriorating influence on his work or not, she certainly made his life a storm. The death of Recanati no doubt seemed to him to be the greatest good fortune that Providence could have bestowed upon him, since it enabled him to pluck from the sky the star at which he had gazed so long and carry it off with him to be the light of his home. But was this a triumph, or was it only disguised failure? While his love was

> A devotion to something afar,

it was a spur to achievement; when it became devotion to the whims and fancies of a most exacting house-mate was it still a spur, or a vexatious thorn in the side? Whether Browning is right or wrong in the deductions that he draws, he is right in the facts from which he draws them, for his authority is Vasari, and Vasari was a pupil of Andrea's and a resident in his house, so that he had ample opportunities of observing both husband and wife.

Here is his unflattering description of Lucrezia[1]:

> There was a most beautiful girl in the Via del Gallo who was married to a hatter, and who, though born of a poor and vicious father, carried about her as much pride and haughtiness as beauty and fascination. She delighted in trapping the hearts of men and among others snared the unlucky Andrea, whose immoderate love for her caused him to neglect the studies demanded by his Art and in great measure to discontinue the assistance which he had given to his parents. Now it chanced that a sudden and grievous illness seized the husband of this woman who rose no more from his bed, but died thereof. Without taking counsel of his friends therefore, without regard to the dignity of his Art or the consideration due to his genius, he took her to be his wife, his love for her having more influence over him than the glory and honour towards which he had begun to make such hopeful advances. But when this news became known in Florence the respect and affection which his friends had previously borne to Andrea became contempt and disgust, since it appeared to them that the darkness of this disgrace had obscured for a time all the glory and renown gained by his talents. But he destroyed his own peace as well as estranged his friends by this act, seeing that he soon became jealous and found that he had besides

[1] Mrs. Foster's Translation.

> fallen into the hands of an artful woman who made him do as she pleased in all things. He abandoned his own poor father and mother for example and adopted the father and sisters of his wife in their stead; insomuch that all who knew the facts mourned over him and he soon began to be as much avoided as he had been previously sought after. His disciples still remained with him, it is true, in the hope of learning something useful, yet there was not one of them, great or small, who was not maltreated by his wife, both by evil words and despiteful actions, none could escape her blows; but although Andrea lived in the midst of all that torment he yet accounted it a high pleasure.

The last sentence seems to show that Andrea himself did not look upon the fusion of the ideal and the real as a disaster, and that his devotion was still a spur and not a thorn, as Vasari—one of the maltreated disciples—would have us believe. It is significant, in any case, that when he comes to consider his master as an artist he attributes his failure to reach the summit of achievement, not to any exterior cause, but to a lack in himself. Had he, he says,

> possessed a somewhat bolder and more elevated mind, had he been as much distinguished by higher qualifications as he was by genius and depth of judgment in the Art he practised, he would, beyond all doubt, have been without an equal. But there was a sort of timidity of mind, a diffidence and want of force in his nature, which rendered it impossible that those evidences of ardour and animation which are proper to a more exalted character should ever appear in him; nor did he at any time display one particle of that elevation, which, could it have been added to the advantages wherewith he was endowed, would have rendered him a truly divine painter. Wherefore the works of Andrea are wanting in those ornaments of grandeur, riches and force, which appear so conspicuous in those of many other masters.

This opinion is shared by Filippo Baldinucci, who, writing in the year 1681, says in his *Lettera sopra i pittori piu celebri del secolo VI* that Andrea is to be highly praised for the powers displayed in his works, but that Raphael, Correggio, and others, soared above him because they possessed *anche altro di più,* that indefinable *something,* that " little more and how much it is," as Browning calls it, or, as Marlowe called it nearly four hundred years before Browning—

> One thought, one grace, one wonder at the least,
> Which into words no virtue can digest.

But though Vasari traces the lack of this crowning grace in Andrea's work to a defect in his own nature he blames Lucrezia severely for one particular episode in the artist's career. King Francis I, having seen and admired some of his pictures, invited him to come to Paris, and in May, 1518, he set out on his long journey. The first work that he executed at the French Court brought him both fame and money, for the King commissioned him to paint a picture of the Dauphin, then about six months old, and was so well satisfied with it that he presented him with three hundred ducats in gold.

This success sent commissions flocking in, and he might have reaped a splendid harvest had Lucrezia left him in peace. Vasari tells the tale with his usual unsparing directness:

> One day he received a letter, after having had many others, from Lucrezia, his wife, whom he had left disconsolate for his departure, although she wanted for nothing. Andrea had even ordered a house to be built for them behind the Nunziata, giving her hopes that he might return at any moment; yet as she could not give money to her kindred and acquaintance as she had previously done, she wrote with bitter complaints to Andrea declaring that she never ceased to weep and was in perpetual affliction at his absence; dressing all this up with sweet words well calculated to move the heart of the luckless man, who loved her too well, she drove the poor soul half out of his wits—above all, when he read her assurances that if he did not speedily return he would certainly find her dead. Moved by all this, he resolved to resume his chain and preferred a life of wretchedness with her to all the glory which his Art must have secured to him.

He goes on to say that Andrea asked the King's permission to return to Florence and arrange his affairs; after which he would come back to Paris:

> He added that when he came back his wife would accompany him to the end that he might remain in France the more quietly and that he would bring with him pictures and sculptures of great value. The King, confiding in these promises, gave him money for the purchase of those pictures and sculptures, Andrea taking an oath on the Gospels to return within the space of a few months, and that done he departed to his native city.

This solemn promise he did not fulfil; once returned to Florence, Lucrezia would not let him leave her, nor would she go with him, while her exorbitant demands tempted him to use the money entrusted to him for her satisfaction, so that had it been otherwise possible he would have feared to present himself again to the King whom he had defrauded. Thus, says a French writer in the *Nouvelle Biographie Universelle*, "*il perdit à la fois l'honneur, le repos de la conscience et la protection d'un grand prince.*"

For his dishonesty there can be no excuse, and Lucrezia's conduct was selfish in the extreme, yet Vasari's account leaves one wondering whether some love for her husband was not existent after all. He kept her well supplied with money, and she knew that he was earning far larger sums in France than he had ever earned in Florence: had she been indifferent to him, therefore, it would have been to her advantage to keep him away so that she might enjoy unstinted admiration and unfettered liberty.

But whatever her feeling may have been, there is no doubt of that of Andrea: Vasari speaks of his delight in once more having the society of his "beautiful wife," while the secret load that his conscience bore with regard to his broken promise to King Francis did not hinder him from keeping faith with his patrons in Florence. The

works that he executed for them—the Assumption, the Annunciation, the *Disputa,* to name but a few of them—and the frescoes in the various churches and cloisters, have stood the test of four hundred years and are familiar to all lovers of art. It is of the *Cenacolo* in *San Salvi* that the story is told that at the siege of Florence in 1529, the ruthless soldiers of Alessandro dei Medici began to pull down the walls of the Convent, but when they came upon Andrea's fresco they were so awed by its beauty that they replaced the stones and left it unharmed.

Vasari gives full value to all these achievements; but though he points out what he considered to be the artist's limitations, he nowhere says that those limitations were recognized by Andrea. The whole argument of Browning's poem is based upon the assumption that he did recognize them, and that he attributed them to Lucrezia's baneful effect upon him, even though at the same time he is made to declare that he would be her husband than without her rise to such heights as Raphael and Michelangelo had done. Since there is no historical evidence of this, it seems hardly fair to depict him as pitting his wife against his art, and an examination of his work shows how closely he associated the one with the other. She was his constant model, sitting for the Madonna in numerous pictures, for the Magdalene in the *Disputa,* for Faith and for Charity in the frescoes. This we know on the authority of Vasari:

> He rarely painted the countenance of any woman in any place that he did not avail himself of the features of his wife, and if at any time he took his model from any other face there was always a resemblance to her in the painting, not only because he had this woman constantly before him and depicted her so frequently, but also, and what is still more, because he had her lineaments engraven on his heart; it thus happens that all his female heads have a certain something that recalls that of his wife.

In view of this testimony it is difficult to maintain that love and art opposed each other in the life of Andrea. As to Lucrezia herself, two records remain which show that she was not so heartless as her detractors would have us believe. Describing a portrait that Andrea painted of himself (now in the *Uffizi*) Vasari says:

> This portrait is in the possession of the above-named Madonna Lucrezia, his wife, who still survives.

A picture by one of his fame would have sold for a considerable sum and had she not cherished some tender memories of him she would no doubt have hastened to dispose of it.

But the incident related by Baldinucci is even more conclusive: forty years after the death of Andrea, he says, a young artist named Jacopo da Empoli was copying his fresco of the Birth of the Virgin in the Cloisters of the Church of the *Santa Annunciata,* when an old lady approached him and paused to look at his work. "That is my

portrait that you are copying," she said, and went on to tell him that she was the widow of the celebrated painter.

What a picture would not that incident make, what a poem might it not inspire! The young artist before his easel, palette on thumb, brush in hand, his face aglow with interest; and Lucrezia, beautiful still in spite of her eighty years, haunting the church so closely associated with the husband who had loved her, the husband who had worked for her, the husband who had painted again and again the face whose lineaments were "engraven on his heart."

Faults she had, faults many and grievous, but not even her sternest accusers can deny that she gloried in the fact that the painter "*senza errori*" was the husband of Lucrezia del Sarto.

MARY BRADFORD WHITING.

AN ASPECT OF EVERYDAY LIFE.[1]

As you pass along streets of fashionable shops, your memory retains a whole mass of impressions. At all events, such has hitherto been the case. Suddenly, however, you come upon something unusual, though you cannot say what it is. In the choice and arrangement of the various objects exposed for sale the shopkeepers somehow make you aware that the world is changing rapidly. All around and within you is a new spirit, of which, up to the present, you have been but vaguely conscious. What we know least of all is the world in which we live, the rhythm of its incessant transformations.

You dwell upon these impressions, curious as to the secret bond between them; about them all there is an apparent disdain of precautions and transitions. It is as though art, from the beginning of the world, had always been cautiously considering, and had now suddenly begun to astound you. Why do these shop windows, which for so long have simply been ceremonious invitations and gracious welcomes, seem now to greet you with a shout or a slap in the face?

Soon you find in them something analogous to the looks and the general aspect of the passer-by. In the whole city there is no longer a single person or thing that does not offer you the puzzle of the age.

You call on a friend; he takes from his pocket a cigarette case, and straightway you have an answer to your problem. The secret of the century is to be found in this tiny box. How strangly simple it is! Nothing but two smooth, unadorned pieces of silver plate, neither clasp nor hinges showing any visible projection, even the edges rounded off, and fastening imperceptibly. In your own pocket you have a cigarette case given to you fifteen years ago. Compare the two. Whereas the artisan of the past indulged in complications and embellishments, his *confrère* of to-day dispenses with all that: twining garlands have disappeared, to be replaced by surfaces and lines.

Then you discover that, in countless shops up to quite recent times, jewellery and morocco-leather work, even dolls resembling African fetishes, are instances of a like simplification. Daintiness and charm, as ideals, are replaced by utility and skill. New houses, too, the entire architecture of the district, and its inhabitants, undergo the same process of rough-casting, so to speak. Trimmed beards and moustaches have disappeared. In drawing rooms unadorned with either cornice or stucco work, shingled females expose

1 Authorized Translation by Fred Rothwell.

the very shape of the cranium, while, out in the street, the natural outline of form is patent to all.

Glance round the room in which you find yourself. What is in the shops soon appears in the home. Note how the angles of the walls have been rounded off like those of the cigarette case. The furniture consists of smooth polyhedrons; the various hangings are valued only for their size or for the fact that they are strikingly monochrome. What does all this signify? Suddenly you imagine you have discovered the symbol of the age: the walls of the drawing room are bare as those of a sick-room; a surgeon's lancet might be regarded as the ideal type of all these objects; you wonder if the architects and house furnishers are not compelling you to live inside a case of surgical instruments!

Not yet is the secret fathomed: the change extends farther still. Through living in this environment, human beings assume varied attitudes and expressions. Writers and artists, who act as their mouthpiece, are engaged in speeding up or slowing down, according to requirements. What is said about books which people praise? Generally that they have no style at all. A sort of mathematical instinct likens them to geometrical theorems. "That's literature" is the worst accusation that can be brought against a book or an article. But what is it expected to be? According to the new spirit, literature must speak to people of nothing but themselves. Plastic art is now valued for its volume or bulk. A very masterpiece may be no more than a sketch, with all details omitted—just a rudimentary model.

Never was an age so disciplined; never has the prevailing taste—alike in women's dresses and coiffures and in the typography of poems—been subjected to so tyrannous a sway. And yet, never was the tyrant more anonymous. One of the most noteworthy signs of this spiritual revolution is that it is taking place simultaneously throughout the so-called civilized world. There is not a single city in the Western hemisphere where we do not find similar attempts being made in art, where we do not see the same objects in the shop windows. Only a short time ago a few hours' journey from home proved sufficient for a man to find himself, the gods be thanked, in quite another land—he had simply to look in the shop windows. But nowadays one would think that somewhere there are half-a-dozen dealers and manufacturers whose business it is to stock a single bazaar for the needs of the universe!

Consider how the word "Europe", like some sudden discovery, is ever in the mouths of our contemporaries. In spite of the meaning it appears to have, and although, according to Nietzsche, it comes to us from Germany, the wonder is that, owing to Whitman, it rings with an American accent. Spiritual frontiers become

obliterated long before political frontiers. This novel state of things must inevitably transform art, which has hitherto been the product of limited ethnical groupings, their most violent effort to distinguish themselves from their neighbours and to react upon them. Both in the individual and in the nation art has responded to a need for domination, for setting oneself above and apart from others; it has been the most pronounced way that a nation had for separating itself from other nations, for relieving that tendency to "the spirit of isolation inherent in the human race" of which Gobineau speaks.

As music is the one universal language it is there that we obtain the firmest hold upon common pre-occupations. Since the time of Wagner, at least, instead of building up vast melodic organisms, alike continuous and indissoluble, musicians have tended to introduce elements that are crude—in the rough, so to speak. For centuries past, music endeavoured to produce the sense of duration; nowadays it builds upon interruption, it aims at being the art of the impermanent and the partial. It splits up time, just as the plastic arts split up space. Tiny scraps of phrases, melodies in embryo, are placed end to end, like chance material in which the workman does not wish to show his hand. The musician obeys the same tendency as the artisan who creates a cigarette case out of two pieces of metal.

If we open one of the new reviews or periodicals, whether it be French, English, Italian, German, or Spanish, we find writers, both in the meaning and in the style of their articles, emphasizing discord and disharmony between events, things, individuals. Their work is wholly one of dissociation. Do not say that analysis has always been the chief part of their task. That which in the past stirred great minds was the urge to bring before the world something coherent that was evolving in their own thought. Their purpose in life was to reveal the relations between things; our contemporaries, both the rivals of Giraudoux and Morand as well as those of Dostoevski, Freud, and Proust, try to discover—and attach great importance to—the very bones and skeletons connected with both things and persons, a man's tendencies clashing with and rebelling against one another in a spirit of anarchy.

What is a poem, according to these newly-fledged reviews? A cascade of unequal lines. Nietzsche assuredly did more to obscure the time-honoured line of demarcation between prose and poetry than is generally imagined. Still, it is mainly from the time of Walt Whitman that we date the popular taste for a free untrammelled rhythm which rejects the regularity of the old-style prosody, repudiating rhyme and pre-established forms. This type of artisan also repudiates everything that comes between the native vein or lode and the finished article: to chisel and trim the rougn block actually seems to him a thing intolerable. There must be no adorning of the

metal plate, nothing but different elements joined together, whose deliberately abrupt aspect is supposed to be the only means of remaining faithful to a virgin inspiration.

The reason why such goods as these are exhibited at the various counters of the world's bazaar is because the human concept of beauty has everywhere changed.

Art is more especially a search after luxuriousness, a craving for profusion and rarity. Until recently the artistic criterion consisted of a certain intricate complexity inherited from the earliest traditions. Suddenly attachment to academic form ends in discouraging the spirit of complacency everywhere; a roistering over-supply of "all the talents" seems to have exhausted the last resources of technique; a brutal rupture is made with every style on the ground that it is too wellknown. It is possible that this may be a necessary stroke of policy. But we are living in times when a clean sweep has been made, when incongruity of any kind is given a place. A new art will become certain, and the hope of our time fulfilled, only when there appears a new logic, a new power and eagerness to apprehend relations and correspondences. Already such signs and tokens as Honegger's "King David" show what really gifted artists can produce from the tentative methods of their extravagant predecessors. Even Satie and Apollinaire may supply starting-points—if only starters will show themselves.

The one thing calculated to injure future creative art is immediate approval and general imitation. Until quite recently a nation, however small, imposed its own taste and style upon the rest of the world. Now we have an œcumenical taste—like the season's fashions —every six months. If we seek whom we are to hold responsible we shall be told that the reign of metal compels us to live in whatever shines or weighs or brutally asserts itself; that the invasion of commerce—and of those made wealthy thereby—into every department of life has spread abroad the cult of the 'sample'; that the simple-minded public, by reason of their progressive encroachments, will listen to none but the most ill-endowed amongst the self-taught. Now all this—along with comfort and sport, two words which represent singularly destructive ideas—displaces the centre of gravity of the spiritual world; another age and another tradition oppose the old classical ideas. France is still at the head of the movement, though it is being carried on against the Græco-Latin order of things.

The formulas of the Renaissance, of the Louis XIV, the Louis XV, and the Louis XVI styles long survived. At first, the Romantics gave them a renewal of life; then, from the very excess of genius which seemed to exhaust all human possibility, these formulas made only more evident the general decline. Mallarmé saw more clearly than any other that the poetical revolution was inevitable because of Victor Hugo:

> Hugo, in his mysterious task, lowered the claims of all prose, philosophy, rhetoric, and history in favour of poetry, and, as he was the very personification of verse, he confined to those who think, discourse or narrate almost the entire right of self-expression[1].

Something similar might be said after the days of Ingres and Delacroix, Berlioz and Wagner, Balzac and Flaubert. No longer was transformation possible by continuing along the old lines: what was needed was a split with the past, complete repudiation, the discovery of virgin soil. This was proclaimed by Nietzsche also in the second part of his *Zarathustra*:

> Nevertheless I grew tired of that spirit; and I see approaching a time when it will be tired of itself.
>
> Before now I have seen poets become transformed, directing their gaze against themselves.
>
> I have seen the coming of propitiators of the spirit: it is among poets that they are born.

Do we recognize this gaze of poets, of all artists, directed against themselves? Surely it is this that often makes us so uneasy when at a concert or in a picture dealer's shop: we feel that artists who appeal for our judgment are conscious of a kind of antecedent shame of their art, that they are making excuse for employing tools well worn by so many hands before themselves, that they are not afraid to be the first to flout and scoff at what constitutes the very rationale of their existence. How could their work become creative when everything around breathes of the craving for destruction? Surely we have here the last of the dogmas succumbing to the attacks of the propitiators of the spirit. We understand why there is no longer in the temple to which our music is dedicated anything but negro fetishes.

For the first time in history we see people acting deliberately in a way that has hitherto happened only after mighty cataclysms. The early Greek sculptors carved out their rude wooden images, their *xoana,* for no other reason than that previous civilizations had bequeathed to them no canon of art. Because of the upheavals following invasion the Merovingian jewellers substituted a surplus of metal for a lack of style. And in these days we see man, the cultured product of civilization, making *tabula rasa,* a clean slate!

RAYMOND SCHWAB.

1 *Divagations, Crise de Vers.*

DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS

This Section of our Journal aims at chronicling not only developments in theological thought and in ecclesiastical organization, but also practical experiments in all branches of religious life and service.

Often when successful attempts have been made to solve some problem in one part of the country, the rest of the Churches remain ignorant, and we trust that these pages will not only serve as a clearing-house of ideas and a record of changing emphasis, but also broadcast valuable information of progress in Church and denominational life.

Our representatives in the Colonies and the United States will from time to time contribute accounts of similar movements. The Editor will be glad to consider brief articles serving this purpose.

THE L.M.S. CHURCHES IN SOUTH INDIA AND THE PROPOSED SCHEME OF UNION.[1]

No attempt is here made at any statement of *pros* and *cons* in the great debate on the Proposed Scheme of Union in South India. These notes provide information which is necessary material for the study of the question from whatever angle it be approached.

First, in the anxiety caused by the seriousness of the issues, let us not forget to rejoice that there is a large and rapidly growing Church in India whose future has given rise to problems of this magnitude. The tables at the end of the printed Scheme of Union show that in the four Councils of the South India United Church which are specially connected with the L.M.S. (North Tamil, Travancore, Kanarese, and Telugu), there is a Christian community of 162,536. The most recent figures received at headquarters bring this total up to nearly 170,000. In the year 1795 five men met together in a Baker Street chop house because of their concern for the spread of " the Glorious Gospel of the Blessed God " among the heathen. To-day in India (including the North), one of the five great fields of the Society which these men founded, 172,533 persons of Indian race name the name of Christ along with ourselves. It is possible to discount the value of the adherence of some of this great number—the same might be said of Home Churches—but after all such allowances have been made, the existence of the Indian Church to-day is an impressive fact for which we render thanks to God.

The 162,000 people in the South constitute more than two-thirds of the existing South India United Church, which was formed in 1908 by the union of all Congregational and Presbyterian churches,

1 The writer wishes it to be known that the following notes are prepared under pressure to take the place of a more carefully considered article which has been lost in the post.—Ed.

both British and American, in South India and Ceylon. This means that in the present discussions the churches which have originated in the L.M.S. will play a decisive part. If the Proposed Scheme of Union were carried out the Christians related to our Society would represent between one quarter and one-fifth of the total Christian community of 738,874 in the new United Church. The Wesleyans would bring in 111,556 Christians, and the Anglicans 395,883, of whom 287,000 are within the sphere of the Church Missionary Society and thus prevailingly evangelical in their type of religion.

While all bodies connected with the South India United Church are to be consulted, the most critical decisions concerning the Union Proposals will be made in the Church Councils. These are composed of all the ministers and lay representatives of the churches within a defined district, and to them belong the oversight and care of the churches within their bounds. Four out of the eight Church Councils in the South India United Church consist practically entirely of churches founded by the London Missionary Society. Although the General Assembly is the representative body of the South India United Church as a whole, it cannot legislate, save on a few defined subjects, without the approval of two-thirds of the Councils, and its constitution cannot be amended save by such a two-thirds vote.

These Councils differ from each other far more than do the County Unions of England. They conduct their proceedings in four different vernaculars, with occasional lapses into English. They vary greatly in size, from the Travancore Church Council which represents 113,730 Christians to the Kanarese Council which represents 1,984. There are still more important differences, as Christian development in these widely scattered areas has been by no means uniform. A report two years ago showed that in the North Tamil Church Council there was only one communicant to 10.82 Christians, whereas in the Kanarese there was one communicant to 3.58 Christians. The Kanarese Council had nine ordained ministers for 1,984 Christians; the Telugu only 10 for a Christian community of 35,723; the Tamil 13 for 13,219; and the Travancore Council only 19 ordained ministers for a Christian community of 113,730.

These things affect the quality of the discussion on the subject of unity. The chief difficulty, alike of protagonists and opponents of the present Scheme, is that the vast majority of the Christians concerned cannot possibly understand it. The Church Councils consist of picked representatives, most of whom can intelligently follow the necessary discussion; but they are painfully aware that behind them is an uneducated mass whose opinion it is extraordinarily difficult for them to represent. From the point of view

of constitutional machinery the Church Council is in this matter all-important, yet in the realities of the situation what is all-important is the little village group of 40 or 50 people, tilling the soil of others, outcastes who through Christ are gaining in life the place of men and women, five out of six quite illiterate, yet all with a dim sense that they are being delivered from the sphere of darkness and demons into the sphere where reigns Jesus Christ, Who is more powerful than the demons or the darkness. The teacher and one or two elders, and no one else, understand enough of a life that goes beyond the village boundaries to take their part in working the constitution of a large and scattered Church. Multiply that village group by perhaps 2,000, and you have some idea of the difficulty of securing a decision which truly reflects the corporate mind of the whole Church on any vital subject.

There are, of course, large town churches, about a score of them, of which this account would be misleading, and there is a good sprinkling of Christian educated Indians well able to evaluate these proposals. Their opinion will inevitably and rightly carry greater weight on Church Councils than their numerical strength would warrant. But it is the village group in mass-movement areas which most needs to be borne in mind by all who would understand or serve the Indian Church. It may be taken for granted that the villages in general vaguely desire Christian unity. Whether they would approve of the present scheme if they understood it is not yet indicated.

How much influence will missionaries exert in the decisions of Church Councils? Save in Travancore, only the ordained missionaries are *ex officio* members of the Church Councils by virtue of the constitution of the South India United Church. Other missionaries sit in the Councils only if they are elected by churches as their representatives. In the smaller Councils the proportion of missionaries is inevitably higher than in the larger, but in all Councils they are in a comparatively small minority and can easily be out-voted. In the Travancore Church Council they are outnumbered by twelve to one. The decision of this matter thus does not rest with the missionaries. Even if in any area a few strong-minded missionaries had any desire to exert an excessive influence over the proceedings —and there is no evidence that such is anywhere the case—the Indians present could and would resist the pressure. Missionaries will exert the influence to which their arguments and their characters are entitled, but if the decisions now to be made are not truly representative of Indian opinion the blame will rest with the Indians themselves, who have every opportunity of plainly registering their conviction.

As yet there has been no corporate or official statement of the

views of L.M.S. missionaries, but early in the discussions a considerable number wrote to the *Christian World* to correct an impression which they believed to be widespread that missionary opinion was favourable to the scheme, and indicated a highly critical attitude to some of its features.

Enough has already been said to indicate that in the area covered by these proposals the L.M.S. has large commitments. It supports 35 missionary men, of whom 29 are ordained ministers, and 29 missionary women. Through its block grants to bodies on the field it partially supports no less than 2,345 Indian workers, men and women of all grades, of whom 54 are ordained ministers. The finance involved is large. Taking Church and Mission together, and including missionaries' salaries, passages, *etc.*, there is spent in this area £76,000, of which £46,000 is supplied from Britain and £30,000 is locally received and appropriated.

Have the Church Councils the right, if they desire, to enter the proposed union without consulting the London Missionary Society? *Yes* and *No*. The South India United Church is an autonomous body. When it was formed in 1908 the L.M.S. Board was not officially consulted and, although cognisant of what was taking place, took no action whatever, evidently regarding the matter as one to be settled by the Indian Church and not by the Missionary Society. Similarly, in the case of the present proposals, on which there is far more divergence of view among the home supporters, it was agreed to postpone official pronouncements until the Church Councils on the field should take some action. Three years ago the Directors of the L.M.S. wrote to those Church Councils which they subsidize to say "the ultimate decisions about Church Union must rest with you, and the London Missionary Society has no desire that it should be otherwise". At the same time they pointed out the advisability of consultation with the L.M.S. Board before the Councils finally entered into any such union as was under consideration. The Councils replied that they certainly would so consult. In view of the large amount of support which the Indian Church Councils are receiving from the Society they will certainly wish to know whether such support will be continued in the event of the Union being consummated. No authoritative answer to such an inquiry could be made without consultation of bodies representing the Home Churches. That is why a Joint Commission has been constituted in Britain of representatives[1], both of the L.M.S. and of the Congregational Unions, to give such advice as may be called for.

1 Cong. Union of England and Wales: Dr. S. M. Berry, Dr. S. Cave, Dr. A. J. Grieve, Dr. J. D. Jones, Rev. T. T. James, and Dr. A. Peel.

L.M.S.: Mr. F. G. Bowers, Rev. W. M. Barwell, Mrs. H. M. Chaffey, Revs. F. Lenwood, G. E. Phillips, and N. A. Turner-Smith.

Supposing, for the sake of argument, this Joint Commission were to declare its opinion that if the Proposed Scheme were to be carried out missionaries would not be likely to offer for service and contributions would seriously diminish, this opinion would have to be reported by the Missionary Society to the Church Councils in India and would obviously carry great weight. This weight would by no means be due only to financial considerations. The Churches of South India cherish a noteworthy reverence towards the Board of that Society to whose operations they owe the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Consequently, while it would technically be open to those Councils, if they were convinced of God's guidance towards Union, to go forward in faith, taking all the risks involved, it is in the highest degree improbable that they would lightly set aside clear advice given by the Missionary Society after consultation with the representatives of the Home Churches.

There is no danger of the Councils being stampeded into hasty decision either for or against. At the moment at which these notes are being written, at the end of August, no official proceedings from the Council have yet reached the Mission headquarters, but information has been received that both the North Tamil and the Telugu Councils have postponed their decision for a year after a discussion mainly unfavourable. The Kanarese Council was to meet later, but its previous discussions have been less favourable than those of the other Councils. The largest Council of all, in Travancore, is to deal with the subject in September, and there is no evidence of what will be its attitude. Evidently another year will be occupied with consideration in India and consultation with Home Churches, and the critical decisions will be made by the Councils in the second half of 1931. The General Assembly will then consider the reports from its eight Councils, and take action accordingly. Even if all Councils were to vote next year in favour, it does not appear possible that union could be consummated before the year 1935.

It is clear that there is no weighting of the scales on the field in favour of the Proposed Scheme, and those who feel anxious about some of its provisions may feel fairly sure that their anxieties are shared and adequately represented by someone or other on the field. At the same time those who see in it, when suitably amended, the opportunity for the realization of a great dream, may encourage themselves with the thought that if this thing is of God it will somehow or other go on. No one need feel anxious for the ark of God. All, however, bearing in mind those humble village groups whose welfare will be promoted or hindered by this plan, and realizing the immensity of the task of the Christian Church in India, are called to pray that its leaders may see clearly what is right, and take no false step at the cross-roads immediately ahead. This is not the only one

of India's problems which are too great to be solved by man's unassisted wisdom, nor the only one to whose solution the best contribution from the Home end can be made by loving and fervent prayer.

GODFREY E. PHILLIPS.

THE FAILURES.

BY A PRISON VISITOR.

WE read quite frequently articles in eulogy of our prison system, of the efficacy of our reform methods, of the healthy tone which pervades our Borstal Institutions. Statistics show that about 80 *per cent* of the people who go to prison never return. What about the other 20 *per cent* ?

Here are some instances in the latter category which I have come across in the course of my work as a prison visitor.

One day last month a knock came to my front door, and upon opening it I was confronted by a dirty, perspiring individual, grinning broadly. He was accompanied by a large tin trunk which apparently contained all his worldly goods. He informed me that he had come from Staffordshire, where he had been working in a mine, to stay with his dear old friend (so he described me), as the work was not to his liking. I was furious with him, because I had only got him the job after a lot of difficulty, and then, just as he was going straight, to throw it up seemed like suicide. I told him to pick up his trunk and go back immediately. He said that he had no money. Of course, I knew that before I asked him. One can usually sense the position when money is the problem. I got him a night's lodging at a doss house. Ringing them up on the telephone later, I found out that he didn't go there. He went back to the prison instead, and demanded admittance, together with his tin trunk. The Governor explained that he could not receive him, so my friend left his trunk in the chaplain's garden, broke into a house near by and gave himself up. The Governor took him in the second time, about a week later. He is quite happy amongst all his old friends, and freedom does not tempt him overmuch. Compared with what he had been used to, prison was a soft job and he knew when he was well off, and so long as he could have a "holiday" now and again he was quite content, and happy, too, happy as the day is long. He simply does not possess a sense of right and wrong; it seems to be impossible to disturb his complacency and arouse in him a desire to go straight.

Another man I know is just the opposite. When first he came to prison he was a man without hope, with a set, grey face. His health had broken down; he was but a shadow of what he must have

been at one time. He was a drug addict. Every few hours a terrible craving seized him, a craving which drove him insane if it were not satisfied. He became an animal, and would go on his knees and kiss the shoes of his guards, begging for relief. He was a terrible sight. The medical staff set to work on him, subjecting him to strict discipline and gradually reducing the dose of drug until he was cured. It took over two years, and at the end of that time he left the prison restored to good health, holding his head up again. It was miraculous. Alas! away from the discipline, his reformation was short-lived, and in three months time he was back again as bad as ever. Again they cured him and again he returned. With all their knowledge of medical skill they were not able to give him that strength of will which was necessary to complete the cure. He is now undergoing preventive detention for ten years, and there seems to be little hope of his ultimate mastery over his affliction. It should be said in explanation that drug taking is not in itself a crime, but the vice drove him into crime in order to obtain the drugs wherewith to satisfy the craving.

Even more pitiable, perhaps, are the dull, stupid criminals who simply sin because, having lost their characters, they have not the wits to do anything else. These are really the most hopeless types of all. Mental sterility is a fatal drawback to acquiring a sense of moral responsibility. I came across a case the other week of a stone-deaf man stealing a pair of wireless headphones. They had been left in a stationary motor car. The incongruous nature of the theft was what brought home to me more forcibly than anything else the hopeless nature of the mentality of this type of criminal. It was simply the itch of possession. Just as a magpie steals shining objects, only to hide them in its nest, so a certain type of criminal steals just because it seems a pity to miss an opportunity. The nature or value of the actual article does not seem to enter into it.

Crime is not all grim, however, and the dark side of life's picture is frequently illuminated by flashes of humour. One light-hearted, perfectly incorrigible thief stole the watch belonging to the Chief Officer whilst he was waiting in the guard room on the morning of his discharge after serving a two years' sentence. He was arrested three hours later and sentenced to a further six months' imprisonment. He has got used to a particular cell and always asks for it each time he gets back again. He told the Governor that he felt that he was entitled to some consideration after sixteen years' service, and that he could not sleep in strange quarters. They humour him. After all, prison is the only home he has ever known.

Instances could be multiplied. Each is interesting and quite distinct, but they all have the one thing in common, namely, the complete absence of any sense of moral values.

It may be asked whether these habitual criminals are utterly irreclaimable, and the answer must always be "No!" We are all children of the one Father, and each of us has a spark of His Divine Spirit within us. In some it is deeper down than in others, but it is present in all of us, making us all brothers. We are apt to look down on a miserable criminal, but it is good to remind ourselves that the Father cares for him just as much as for us, for we are all equal in the sight of God. If anything, God would care for him more, because he needs help more. And, after all, re-birth has been effected in even more hopeless cases than those found in prison nowadays. Remember Elizabeth Fry! And so, although ordinary everyday folk who undertake prison visiting may seem to fail more often than to succeed, the measure of success is not always seen in immediate result. No good deed is ever lost, and although the result which we aim at may not be achieved, who shall say that therefore we have failed? We may not break a man of his prison habits, but if we work on the right lines, we cannot fail to influence his life for good in some way. Real faith can work wonders, for it is an appeal to all that is finest in a man, and the fact that someone believes the best of him has been the turning point in many a man's life.

The other week I read a headline in a paper which thrilled me more than any piece of news since Armistice Morning. It said:— "The Salvation Army goes to Devil's Island". Could there be any finer example of faith and hope than that? Devil's Island! The grave of manhood, hope, faith, love, all that makes life worth while. The Salvation Army goes to Devil's Island.

I started my work with renewed vigour. How could failure be contemplated in the face of courage like that?

ALEC R. ELLIS.

PROFESSIONALISM IN RELIGION.

A WELL-KNOWN minister has recently said that organized religion is on its death-bed. Of course it is easy enough to contradict the statement. Contradictions are as a rule easy enough to make. One suggests that a calm enquiry into the matter might be rather more effective. Or to put it in another way: would it not be wiser to try to discover a possible weakness in the constitution of organized religion as we see it to-day? Various phases of the weakness may occur, must occur, to the thoughtful mind.

On this occasion I have taken the liberty of referring to a matter which in my opinion is relevant to the discussion. I allude to a certain professionalism which is apparent in almost all denominations. This professionalism is chiefly centred in the minister himself. Consciously or unconsciously he is apt to regard himself as

a specialist. Every specialist must of necessity be a professional. In other words he has specialized. And to have done this is to have attained a certain position of superiority.

A quite natural one. A cheesemonger is entitled to boast he can strip a cheese with greater facility than a mere outsider. Indeed he has no need to boast. He knows. Others not cheesemongers are quite willing to accept inferiority. A professor of Greek occupies a unique position, that is to say, amongst folk who cannot as much as grasp the Greek alphabet. A railway engine driver presumably knows more about the mechanism of his engine than any railway director. The old saying, "In the kingdom of the blind the one-eyed man is King", speaks for itself. And indeed were we but discussing matters of Greek, engines, cheese, or blindness we should be bound to admit the rights and claims of respective professionals in the various capacities.

Ministers too have a right to claim superiority in intellectual affairs. A college education has yielded good crops. A familiarity with the pen has granted fluidity of thought. A knowledge of books has brought much information. In all these things the average minister of all denominations stands much higher than the average man in the street or even the average man in the pew.

Were the minister a teacher or a lecturer he would be entitled to speak with all due authority, just as the specialist in medicine or the provision dealer in cheese. The analogy holds good. But when you have, as it were, widened your province you meet with a somewhat difficult and delicate problem.

Readers of the life of Ruskin will remember that when a very little boy he mounted on a chair in the nursery and preached a sermon, "People, be dood". This was an excursion into the land of professionalism. The child was father to the man. And more: the arming of authority was seen in full force of principle. Ruskin's sermon, as far as we know, was directed to the furniture of the nursery. Would it have been very surprising had one of the chairs put a question to the preacher? "By what authority?". That question has been echoed throughout the ages. It has had a curious effect.

Whole establishments have come crashing to the ground. Foundations have been shaken. Sacrosanct positions have been demolished. "By what authority?". Some people are wise enough or unwise enough to think that the query has now lost its force. So far from that being true, the evidences for the contrary to-day stand out clear and vivid. No, the queston is not of place and neither are questioners dumb. Yet one must add that there is a vocal silence.

Language may be represented by signs. Signs and symptoms may be even more effective than words. Men to-day do not rise from their seats in church to put the question "By what authority?". They

simply proclaim by their absence from the seats their own reply to the unspoken demand.

Many ministers have virtually relinquished the position of authority. Glance at the titles of sermons published on a Saturday morning. They speak for themselves. As a simple matter of fact the preacher of to-day is finding his professoriate of religion a very fragile thing. The reason is fairly obvious. He knows he does not possess the necessary authority. He can say a good deal about God. He finds it is very difficult to say much of God. The growing intelligence of men and women renders the lot of the minister—at least on the professional side—an almost anomalous one.

Folk know as much about God as he does. He may dogmatize to his heart's content, but his action is somewhat akin to that of the lad who whistled to keep up his courage in crossing the church-yard. Or change the illustration: is it not true that the professional minister uses his profession to cover a multitude of ignorances?

In the course of my reading this morning I found: "The word 'eternal' is at present as inunderstandable as infinite space". Yet consider the number of sermons preached on "eternity", all with a glib assurance of absolute accuracy.

One has noticed that when a specialist in other departments finds himself sorely puzzled he seems to take refuge in verbiage. At all events he is pretty sure to know rather more about the subject than his audience. Professionalism in the pulpits is most marked where infallibility is most in evidence, and infallibility is by no means confined to any one Church.

You may go into a grubby-looking mission hall, with surroundings of the most glum and depressing nature and a preacher whose grammar is not exactly on the level of Lindley Murray, and yet meet with the *nth* degree of dogmatic certainty. And the certainty will well nigh cover the whole province of theology and philosophy. Such a preacher is aware that once he allows any "perhaps" and "may be" and "let us hope", his congregation will lose confidence in the pulpit. The doctrine must be hot and strong, and undiluted with the faintest suspicion of the slightest doubt.

Or enter the doors of a high Anglican church and observe the emphasis upon a certain interpretation. "Thus saith the Lord", and the terms are re-echoed by the self-appointed interpreter. Between the murky little mission hall and the magnificent Gothic building is a variety of theological tones. Traces, distinct and significant, of professionalism are found throughout.

Many clergymen in all churches betray the professional vocation by their very voice and manner in conducting a service. They do not mean to be pompous and unreal; probably they are unconscious of the faults. But the faults are there. The desire to impress; the

wish to pose; the inclination to act a part, are only too plainly visible.

The truth is that in many cases the preacher gets more and more to depend upon artificial aids. Is this very surprising? Think of it! One hundred sermons to be preached to the same people—with very little variation—every year. So that if a preacher remains at the one church for ten years he may have delivered about one thousand sermons. Some ministers remain longer than ten years at the one place. Twenty years with a possible product of two thousand sermons. Forty years with a possible product of four thousand sermons.

One repeats "Is it very surprising that in such circumstances the artificial comes, as it were, into its own?". One effect of professionalism is to sharpen a certain sense or conception of the unnaturalness of religion. Religion is made to seem of an abnormal exotic nature. Preachers are apt to be regarded as actors. The man in the street, after all, has religious ideas and is really open to spiritual influence. Too often he is asked to subscribe to theological doctrines of which he cares little or nothing.

To speak very plainly, the churches in general have got a bad name with many people. It is true that if you were to ask some of these folk the reason they would be in a difficulty to explain. Probably you would be told there was "something". It does not follow because a critic cannot put his case in a lucid way that therefore the criticism is without value. I seriously suggest that this nameless objection has much to do with a certain want of confidence in the men who occupy the pulpits. And when you have pressed for a little more explanation it is likely you will be told that preachers say a very great deal in order to conceal their ignorance.

There is another phase. Plain John Smith may say that he believes in God, but that belief is not necessarily attached to the so-called agent. Ask John for a still further confession. And this is pretty well what he will say or what he wants to say:

"Ministers are theorists. If they believed one tenth of what they say they would be wildly practical. I know circumstances are in the way. I know they are just human beings and therefore liable to the weaknesses of humanity. But why on earth do they so often present religion as almost a de-humanized affair?"

It is, of course, very easy for ministers to retort: "Look here, Mr. John Smith, who are you to preach to us? The same law of life concerns you as much as ourselves. Do you, can you, square your actions with high principles? Would it not be better to employ a glazier at home before throwing stones at our windows?"

To all this plain John rejoins, "Yes, I know what you say is true, but please remember I don't go up into a pulpit and preach a gospel of perfection".

We need not call any more evidence from either side. If John Smith could translate in a few words his objections to going to a place of worship he would say that to do so would be to find an atmosphere of unreality. That unreality is derived from a sense of professionalism.

It was said about Garrick—and probably there is some truth in it—that on one occasion a Bishop who sat next to him at dinner exclaimed, "Mr. Garrick, I want to ask you a question. How is it that while the pulpit, dealing with the awful realities of life and death, finds such a comparatively weak response from the congregation, the stage, on the other hand, which simply prefers to deal with artificial representations, easily moves an audience even to tears?". The great actor replied: " You see, my Lord, the Church too often presents realities as though they were unreal. We on the boards endeavour to offer unrealities as being supremely real."

Surely the whole purport of this article is contained in the above. Religion should be as natural as the food we eat and the life we live. Professionalism in the Church tends to produce an unnatural conception of religion. Hence the attitude of the average man, whether he be of the street or otherwise. The matter is worth thinking about.

W. H. Jacobsen.

FROM PRINCIPLE TO PROCEDURE.

A STUDY CONCERNING MODES OF WORSHIP.

Very interesting is the intensified emphasis which is being laid at present in non-liturgical churches upon the matter of the ways of worshipping congregations. It at least indicates that at last these churches, in coming into a knowledge of their poverty, have come to the threshold of a new procedure. To discerning observers it had become increasingly evident that there was need for activity in this direction. The "service" had been swallowed up in the sermon. All things else in the "order of worship" were but tributary to this essential thing. Much could be overlooked if this was made potent. The Puritans, regarded as the militant section of Protestantism, gave up all things that the spoken word might be made synonymous with the eternal word. They achieved greatly if not fully. And we, their children's children, are left with a heritage and—a task.

Without delving into the philosophy of it (since this is not needful for our present purpose) the fact is plain that in the progress of reform, almost without exception, the new wealth is offset by a new

poverty. Becoming accustomed to the new glory we find ourselves confronted with the new bleakness. Our fathers in projecting themselves forward arrowed their forces to a purposive point, even to the falling backwards of some of their forces. They made progress at a certain point, but not all along the line. Our task to-day is to straighten out the line. Some aggressive Protestants seem to have been working in such a way as to straighten in the line. That is to say, in justifying the sermon as that which revealed God they omitted to give thought to those procedures by which men may approach God. In other words, Protestantism generally in stressing the *worthship* of God forgot to train men in the worship of God, with the result that the preachers of to-day who are spiritually ancestored in the Puritans know, in the main, how to present an argument but not how to create an atmosphere.

This is our poverty and our problem. Our fathers crusaded in their day to the point of victory, but in so doing they created for us the need for a new virtue. And that need is expressed by asking how we, who, through them, have entered into a new *worthship* of God and of ourselves, shall come into an adequate sense of corporate worship. They arrived at a principle; it is ours to develop a procedure of realization. It is not enough to rest in their custom. Changing conditions have made ancient good uncouth. Puritanism left us a backwash of soured virtues. Men came to think that in austerity, as such, there was virtue. The new morality gave us the new monasticism. Puritanism arose to make a new emphasis on the need for being divine. Then it came to persist in men who thought that to be divine was but another way of saying that they should be different. Instead of a new beauty there came a new bleakness.

There is always danger in living in our father's creed to the denying of our father's faith. Protestantism, in its corporate expression, was the seeking of a new approach to God. Unfortunately, as so often happens in movements born in antipathy, it became the victim of its own aggressiveness. Antagonistic to everything that savoured of "Romanism", it brought itself to a new poverty as well as to a new power. Too often that which began as an attempt to find a new approach to God finished by becoming merely an argument about God. But now men are asking that in church they shall come to an apprehension of God in a way not attainable through a presented argument. They want to know how God may be experienced. They are asking for that proof of God which comes through living experience. They say, in effect, that it was good that our fathers established for us the right to worship, but who now will show to us the right way to worship? It is one thing to arrive at a principle; it is another to achieve a rewarding procedure.

Hence the strong protest in our time against what Forsyth

scathingly termed "the hugger-mugger" services of our day. Nonconformity has need in our time not to clean the house so much as to furnish it. To approach God so as to apprehend Him experientially calls for an æsthetic as well as an ethic. You cannot have a group of people worship to the realizing of God unless you have an acceptable code. There must be a basis of understanding. And this calls for an adequate procedure. It is just at this point that non-liturgical churches have been found to be weak. They have carried their virtues on to their own undoing. Verily they did protest too much. Coleridge in his day could say: "I am a member of the Holy Catholic Church, of which at present I am the only member". In playing up their differences men thought they were revealing their divineness. Religion was the sum of their repellencies. Religion was for them a thing of God and the soul.

Since that day, however, men have been growing into a new appreciation of the relationships of life. It is now seen that man is not so much a soul as he is a *socius*. He is not a forlorn Robinson Crusoe, standing unrelated to the universe; rather is he what he is in and through the relationships in which he exists. The new sciences of psychology and sociology have quickened in us a new sympathy. The significance of this for corporate worship is evident. Knowing our individual idiosyncrasies we are also made conscious of our corporate idealisms. And the way of our worship for our day is to work out a procedure which shall strengthen this consciousness in our common acquaintance with God.

With the specific way of this realization we are not here concerned. It is futile for one man to lay down a procedure for general use. General suggestions may be made, but for every congregation the way of salvation is of its own final making. In the line of general suggestions the following may be offered for those who have responsibility for the ordering and leading of worship. In the first place, remember the end to be achieved. In a day when book and magazine are presenting the arguments for and against religion as was not possible in the days previous to a cheap printing press and before the days of common education, the need for the argumentative presentation of religion (at least in the morning worship hour) is considerably diminished. There was a time when it was thought necessary for a congregation in the morning worship to proclaim unitedly its common belief in a series of theological propositions more or less metaphysical in content. Some one has acutely said that if a creed cannot be sung in church it had better not be said. If anything is said in credal form in our churches to-day the emphasis should be such as to strengthen the common morality of the worshipping congregation. The congregational use of creeds with a theological emphasis is a relic left over from other times and

other conditions, and is apt to raise speculative inquiries in the intelligent person rather than increase his spirituality. We have other ways of advertising our theological beliefs in this day.

This leads to a related suggestion. The mode of worship should be such as will create an attitude rather than raise an argument. Not that the minister should not, on occasion, be ready to present an argument for the faith which is in him; that is not the point. The thing that should be manifest is that while he has the argument in reserve the thing he is seeking to do is to create an atmosphere in which men can inbreathe God. There was a time when preachers were referred to as divines; I have often prayed that some of them might have some analogy to a dynamo. They had acquaintance with the proprieties, but none with the fact of power. The chief task of a minister in our time is not so much in preaching a sermon, important as that is, but in working through the whole service in such a way as to build up a highway to God. Some ministers have been so keen on presenting a theology that they have forgotten to give thought to the need for persuading the temperaments of their people. It is one thing to preach a morality in general, but the minister who would have his people experience God must give careful thought to their moods. We have found from sorry experience that an explained God is not always the same thing as an experienced God. The wise minister of to-day will give much thought to the matter of the temperaments of his congregation as well as to the matter of the theology he preaches. To take men as they are and to relate them to God as He is is the task of the ministry to-day. It is ours to see that our congregations are not custom-burdened but Christ-filled. Many know that they have the right to worship, but many of these have not entered into that fuller worth wherein they come to the realization of God by knowing the right way to worship. For many this is the way out to a larger, fuller, corporate life in the church of which they are members.

FRED SMITH.

ON LIFE AND BOOKS.

TWO INTERNATIONAL COUNCILS.

I have before me on the table two books[1], one of which I have read many times, the other of which I have carefully studied. Both are the *Reports* of International Ecclesiastical Councils, the one of 400 Congregationalists —I suppose I must say representative Congregationalists—the other of 300 Bishops of the Anglican Communion. Both Councils undoubtedly had as their primary object the application of the Christian Gospel to the life of to-day: that must serve as justification for discussing their Reports under the heading "On Life and Books".

In regard to the International Congregational Council, I purpose to discuss not so much the *Report* as the Council itself. And I propose to take all the compliments for granted. We presented so many bouquets to each other, and any that were left over were distributed by such journalists as noticed the Council, that a second innings is unnecessary—such a mixture of metaphors being allowed only in this section of our journal. Suffice it to say that the town of Bournemouth (which surely will aspire to become a city after having been so described by Americans on numerous occasions) was delightful in every way—its weather, its people, its Mayor, its Bishop (the Moderator of the Council); the speaking was good, the American not less so than the English; the international fellowship was happy and inspiring—to meet old friends from across the seas and meet new ones was perhaps the supreme gift the Council brought.

But if nobody said any more than this would the whole truth have been told, would accurate history have been chronicled? One or two members of the Council from the United States, notably Dr. G. L. Cady and Dr. W. E. Barton, have attempted a judicial estimate of the Council's work, and it may be well if something of the kind is attempted on this side. An acute observer said some time ago:

> All truth about human beings contains a greater or less measure of criticism. George Wyndham was one of those few beloved of the gods whom contemporaries find it difficult to criticise.

The Fifth International Council is not George Wyndham! Nevertheless, to tell the truth about one's own times is an experiment fraught with danger to the teller. Sir Walter Raleigh, explaining why he had not written the history of his own times, said:

> Whosoever in writing a modern history, shall follow truth too near the heels, it may haply strike out his teeth.

Despite his caution, and despite the fact that his *History of the World* only came down as far as B.C. 170, Raleigh lost not merely his teeth but his head! I cannot fare worse than that!

One or two speakers suggested that the Council failed in not having more young people among its members and more women on its platform. These criticisms, I think, were quite justified. The American delegation had a much lower average age than the British, but it must be remembered that in British Congregationalism a man of fifty is a mere youth. Probably

1 *The Living Church.* Proceedings of the Fifth International Congregational Council, Bournemouth, July 1-8, 1930. Edited by Albert Peel. Cong. Union of England & Wales. 5s. *Lambeth Conference,* 1930. Encyclical Letter from the Bishops, with the Resolutions and Reports. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d. and 2s. 6d.

not one British speaker was under 40, and not more than two under 50. And, for better or for worse, it is extremely difficult for a person over 30 at the time of the War to understand the mentality of post-war youth.

I should dearly have loved to introduce to the Council some really young people, say from 20 to 25, and given them the floor for five minutes. They would have been outspoken, unfair, arrogant, but they would have let us all see ourselves as they see us, and they would have brought us to earth with a bump! And it would have been good for us, for I am inclined to think that Conferences and Councils, like presidents, parsons, and pedagogues, monarchs, ministers, and magnates, rarely hear the *naked* truth. My little group would have listened restlessly to our laments about the modern indifference to the Church, and then one of them would have said something like this:

> You want to know why the Churches don't count with youth? I'll tell you. You don't count because you don't care enough for us, and because you don't really mean business. What effort, what sacrifices do you Church folk make to show that you care? You don't even trouble to talk in a language that we can understand, and you shirk all the real problems of our everyday life. You don't put yourselves to any trouble to seek us. Talk about leaving the 99 in the wilderness and seeking the *one* lost, you don't even trouble to leave the one you've got to seek the 99!
>
> Those issues where you ought to count you leave severely alone. Housing and unemployment, what have you done about them? War, where are you, in heaven's name? Look how you've taken the failure of the Disarmament Conference lying down!
>
> The trouble with you religious leaders is that you are too smug and self-satisfied, too rich and comfortable. What sacrifices do you make for your religion? Jesus, Whom you call Lord, He sacrificed all right; He sought the lost, and went about doing good, never thinking of Himself; He gave His life. But you lot, with your pilgrimages and your banquets, your cars and your best hotels, where is your sacrifice?
>
> You are always denouncing youth. You think that tennis and dancing and golf and bridge are all we want. How little you know how we yearn for guidance and help, how we have looked to you, and you have let us down! We have grown up with the torment of sex in us, and countless voices about it around us, but you have been silent, I suppose because the subject was difficult and you were afraid to offend rich folk in your suburban congregations. We have married, and we have looked to you for help, but you have left us to Dr. Marie Stopes. . . .

And then, as the speaker boiled over in his indignation, the Council would have boiled over too! But, with all its unfairness, is there not enough of truth in tirades of this sort to make us uneasy in conscience and troubled in spirit? When we read this *Report* or think of our programme or our personnel, were we practical enough, direct enough, helpful enough? Did the devil's servants in Bournemouth, in London, throughout the world, tremble because we—and the Bishops—were in session? Is it any easier for the Congregationalist and the Anglican and the stranger within their gates to do right, any harder for them to do wrong, because our International assemblies have been held?

When I look back with these things in mind, several features strike me about our own Council.

I. On a number of urgent topics where we might have had something direct and useful to say we did not touch at all—or but scarcely. Among them were these:

   (a) *The religious education of the young.* In this year of the 150th anniversary of the founding of Sunday Schools, at a time when

the extension of the school age to 15 and the welcome given to agreed syllabuses of religious teaching are uniting to give special opportunities to the churches, we were silent—or nearly so. Do Congregationalists in high place know the kind of teaching given in many of their Sunday Schools, and in many Elementary and Secondary Schools? Are they happy about it, contented with it?

(b) Similarly we did not even whisper guidance on matters relating to *sex*. At a season when humanity is seething with sexual disturbance we had nothing constructive to say. If there is one class of person to whom the churches owe more than another, for example, it is the surplus women, and yet we have not a word to say to help them. No minister with a congregation of any size but knows the urgency of the problem in the lives of many women of 25 and over, to whom life has denied its natural expression in wifehood and motherhood.

(c) *Missionary policy*. The rise of nationalism, the assumption by Governments of many of the medical and educational responsibilities previously carried by Missions, and, perhaps above all, the demands of the indigenous church movement, make the discussion of missionary policy a pressing need. Again we said not a word.

II. On all these, and many other important matters, it should have been possible to secure an interchange of opinion between Congregationalists from far-scattered fields. But it was only in private conversations that this was achieved. Once in ten years we meet together. During the interval new problems emerge, and new methods are tried. Surely the Council is the occasion when abundant opportunity should be provided for the description and discussion of such problems and methods. I, for example, should have liked to learn something from American Congregationalists about the extent of gambling and the way they tackle it, about their Church and Vacation Schools, about ministerial training and the ministry of women, about the duties of deacons, and about Church music. Americans, I know, had many questions in their minds about our Church life.

It is manifestly impossible, of course, to include everything in a week's programme, but this particular feature should never be omitted. A Session devoted to questions and answers might even be well worth while.

III. Was there not something particularly unhealthy in the way we constantly discussed questions of order, and examined the symptoms of our denominational health? Morning and night we took our temperature, and measured our blood pressure every noon, until at last we began to believe that we were really ill. If truth be known, there is more vital religion, a firmer grip of truth, and more sacrificial service in our Congregational Churches to-day than ever in their history. If only we could forget ourselves in the next ten years, and concentrate on winning the world for Christ! If only we could see the grandeur of our task, and magnify our mission! C. E. Montague once said that men did not get a square deal out of life because it was so short and the world was so wonderful. Writing at the age of 57 (when, had he known it, he had only four years to live) he said:

> . . . the world looking so fine—finer every year, and more of it. There's some downright bad adjustment about the life of *homo sapiens*

> in relation to the amount of tiptop stuff provided for his enjoyment. I, for one, have only just begun to get anything like the full enjoyment of the pilgrimage, and I doubt if I've got more than 43 years to live.
>
> I should like to translate that into spiritual terms as affecting the work and witness of the Congregational Churches: so many glorious and splendid things to do, and life all too short for the doing of them. Let us forget our weaknesses and our ailments: to be too solicitous about health is as harmful for a Church as for an individual. And it is God's Church, and God's work, not ours. Luther said the last word about that, in his own lusty way:
>
> > I tell our Lord God plainly that, if He will have His Church, He must keep it Himself, for we cannot keep it, and if we thought we could, we should be the proudest asses in the universe!

All this does not mean that the Fifth Council was a failure. Far from it. But if the Sixth is to be still better, we must file our observations now. Valuable through its papers and its fellowship, the Council made little direct contribution to the life of the churches, and gave little practical help either to ministers or to those face to face with the complex problems of modern civilization. Its *Report* is by no means so valuable as the *Report* of the Fourth Council (which contains the findings of Commissions on both sides of the Atlantic), despite the fact that, as a Council, the Fifth was immeasurably superior to the Fourth.

Steps of great importance were taken when it was arranged that, through the Moderator's services and appointed committees, the Council should continue to function during the next decade. One thing is plain: the programme for 1940 should be prepared by an international committee, even though that mean an ocean trip for half-a-dozen people in 1939. This committee should not only plan the programme and decide on what lines experience may usefully be pooled; it should also try to foresee every eventuality. When customs in countries vary—as, for example, in the functions of persons appointed to open discussions—the procedure should be explained to all concerned. Only so can misunderstanding be avoided.

If by these and other means the Sixth Council can be made as great an improvement on the Fifth as the Fifth was on the Fourth, the International Congregational movement may be said to have been placed on really fruitful lines.

Turning to the Lambeth *Report* we find the results of discussion, but not the oratory. After an Encyclical Letter there are 75 Resolutions, and then the Reports of Committees on "The Christian Doctrine of God", "The Life and Witness of the Christian Community", "The Unity of the Church", "The Anglican Community", "The Ministry of the Church", and "Youth and its Vocation".

Again a good deal of attention is paid to questions of order, but the Bishops are to be congratulated on facing up courageously to practical problems, particularly those of sex and the use of contraceptives. The size of clerical families proclaims, what is, of course, freely admitted, that the majority of married clergy employ some form of conception control, a fact that has made it cowardly as well as foolish for any Church to ignore the question. Thousands of young married people within the churches would gladly have welcomed guidance, had their ministers been more frank, or perhaps only more enlightened! The Bishops have now said plainly that intercourse between married people "has a value of its own" apart from its purpose of procreation, and, further, that there may be circumstances in which religious people, after due thought and with unselfish motives, may

use contraceptives. From some comments it might be thought that the Bishops had thrown open the flood-gates of licence. As a matter of fact, those gates were wide open already; the qualified, carefully-guarded resolution of the Conference can do nothing but good, for it recognizes the situation, and is a genuine attempt to give guidance.

In the same spirit is the Report of the Youth Commission. We read:

> Youth waits impatiently for definite leadership from the Church, particularly (a) in the making and the use of money, and (b) in regard to war.
>
> We believe that Youth of this generation is sound at heart. It has admittedly struck its tents and is on the march, and though it does not always know in which direction it is moving, it is looking for leaders and will follow them if they give a lead which is both sane and daring.

It is to be regretted that the same open-eyed, progressive outlook is not evident in other parts of the *Report*. The resolutions in regard to the ministry of women and to "voluntary clergy" are extremely conservative, and in regard to the union of the Churches (to which reference is made in the Editorial) quite reactionary, for the eyes of the Bishops were deliberately turned from their neighbours at home to the Eastern Church. And it is amusing after reading, under "Race", the resolution affirming that "all communicants without distinction of race or colour should have access in any church to the Holy Table of the Lord, and that no one should be excluded from worship in any church on account of colour or race" to turn to Resolution 42, dealing with the permission a Bishop in special areas may give to Anglicans to communicate in non-episcopal churches, and to "baptized communicant members of Churches not in communion with our own" to communicate in Anglican churches. This magnificent, free, and open invitation to all sinners to come to the table of the Lord carries this "explanatory note":

> In view of the dangers of misconception, we think it desirable to say that in recognizing that the Bishop of the Anglican Communion may under very strict regulations and in very special circumstances permit individual communicants to join with members of other Christian bodies in their Services of the administration of the Lord's Supper, we felt bound to consider the difficulties created by special conditions, especially in some part of the Mission Field. But we would point out that the very special circumstances and the very strict regulations specified in this Resolution of themselves show that we are not departing from the rule of our Church that the minister of the Sacrament of Holy Communion should be a priest episcopally ordained.

That is to say, it is far more important to secure that Christians of another race may have communion with you than those who live next door! O, for reality! O, that Anglicans, as well as Congregationalists, could forget themselves and think only of the Kingdom of God! There are some great words in the Encyclical Letter:

> First, it is for us in the Church, who believe in and try to live according to the Gospel of the Incarnation, to humanize religion, if we would commend it to our generation. The estrangement between Youth and the Church arises partly from the fact that all the interests of life which to them are real and engrossing—science, art, music, literature, recreation, sport, friendship—seem to be quite other than the things in which the Church is interested. To them we appear to be largely pre-occupied with dogmatic and ecclesiastical questions remote from common concerns.

Will these two *Reports* remove that impression? I wonder.

ALBERT PEEL.

FOREIGN REVIEWS.

ON LUTHER AND ON PAUL.

Die Mystik des Apostels Paulus. von ALBERT SCHWEITZER, D.Theol., D.Phil., D.Med. Tübingen : J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck). 16 Marks.

La Réforme allemande et la Littérature francaise. par W. G. MOORE, B.A. (Oxon.), D.ès L. (Strasb.). Publications de la Fac. des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg. 50 francs.

Mr. Moore is an Englishman and a Free Churchman. A scholar of the Queen's College, Oxford, he was, after graduation, awarded the Zaharoff Scholarship for extended study of the French language. He has just returned from Strasbourg University where he spent two years, and where a doctorate in the faculty of letters was conferred on him. This large volume of 500 8vo pages is his doctorate thesis. He is now a lecturer in Victoria University, Manchester. It is a notable achievement for an Englishman to have accomplished such a successful piece of original research and to have embodied his results in such a considerable mass of writing in that most difficult of all European languages as far as idiomatic composition is concerned. At the same time, it is rather the subject of the thesis and its treatment which interest us here. It is piquant that the money given for research by such a remarkable international figure as the Levantine Sir Basil Zaharoff, financial magnate, naturalized Englishman, and pro-French enthusiast, should have been used by an English scholar to demonstrate the debt which French literature owes to that German of Germans, Martin Luther. The antagonism between the spirit of Germany and that of France is nowhere more sharply brought out than in the realm of language and letters. The vivid staccato of French, with its high lights, its quick flashes, its rapier-like thrust and parry, seems to differ so entirely from the firm, almost sombre, touch of German, with its long involved sentences, its steady swing and calculated balances, its insistence on accurately finished detail. Was it not Mdme. de Staël who said that German was useless as a *salon* language because each sentence must be finished in order to get to the verb? And then, beside that, Luther is so much a symbol and epitome of German nationalism, of which indeed he was in a sense the creator, that to demonstrate a connexion between his spirit and the essential treasures of French literature—a literature which, in spite of Pascal, seems to be characterized more by sparkle and brilliance than by faith and passion—would be rather a triumph for the Puritans. 'Tis true, of course, that Racine was educated at Port Royal, which certainly had both faith and passion. And that intense sense of reality there nourished is perhaps responsible—I have often thought so—for the clear incisiveness, the instinctive selection of the significant and rejection of the irrelevant, which makes Racine the supreme example of French classic style at its best. Port Royal had taught him the difference between gold and tinsel. The disciple of Pascal's community knew that nothing but the right answer would be marked, and was ashamed of anything less than perfectly-cut jewels. The Strasbourg *milieu* is perhaps the only one in which both French and German literature can be really appreciated by the same scholar (bi-lingual) without racial bias either way. Dr. Schweitzer, the truest example of the German religious spirit in our day, once congratulated an English lady in fun on having written him such an admirable French letter that she was worthy to be called a daughter of Racine. So that it was a very happy chance which took Mr. Moore to Strasbourg and

threw him into the company of the Protestant scholars there, and particularly into that of Prof. Strohl, son of an Alsatian father and a French mother, and educated in Berlin at the feet of Treitschke, yet with a knowledge and love of French history and the French spirit equalled by few. And it was a stroke of genius on the part of somebody to set Mr. Moore on the task of demonstrating the connexion between literature and faith—French literature and German faith. In a recent book Ethel Mannin records an outburst of Douglas Goldring against the pernicious and foolish doctrine of "art for art's sake". He is right. Art and literature are forms of expression. Without faith and passion there is nothing to express. The medievals knew that we must have substance as well as form. They cannot exist separately. Literature is form. Faith is substance. Pondering under the frescoed ceiling of the Sistine chapel a few weeks since, we decided, as so many have done, that there is something in the tortured manliness of Michelangelo which the rosy curves of Raphael could never reach. His Adam in the centre of the roof there is a Rupert Brooke, seeming to question his Maker with delightful and genuine deference. "Well, sir, you've created me; I hope you're right; you'll forgive my not being perfectly sure about it myself." But Buonarroti had doubt, not faith, some may object. That, of course, is precisely what we are saying. The smugness of Raphael is not faith. For faith can only be born of experience, and the face of experience is lined with thought and doubtings. The shrewdest of the churchmen who employed him knew that Michelangelo was no orthodox believer. They would not have had him so, lest the craftsman should have vanished. Luther was a child of the same spirit. Can it really be demonstrated that the pliant grace, the elastic strength, and the vivid light and shadow of French literature owe as much to Luther's religious genius as to the light firm touch of du Bellay? An interesting thesis, in truth.

Mr. Moore believes that the great soul makes the great style. He shows us Luther as a stylist in his own vernacular, in

> a passage written in 1530, which will serve as an example of the developed prose of his ripe period. In it we find almost all the elements of his great style; the touch of popular interpretation, which employs proverbial sayings and the first familiar image that comes to mind; the art of grouping words and phrases so as to give to a whole passage the rhythm properly pertaining to it; and the passion which makes use of all these means to give life to a complete piece drawing its strength from, and shot through with, the character and, above all, the ardent will-force of the author.

He shows us François Lambert and Guillaume Dumoulin visiting Luther in Wittenberg, and of course the obvious connexions with France through Strasbourg itself.

> 'Tis above all to Strasbourg, a Germanic city, that the honour belongs of having nourished the indigenous plant of the French Reformation with alien sustenance.

Sometimes Luther's German writings were rendered into Latin by his disciples, and thence by others into French. Elsewhere the translation was made directly from the original. We cannot forbear quoting one quaint example, which offers as pleasing a comparison of the contemporary dialects as do the famous Strassburg oaths of Charles the Bald's period.

> Ein fogel singt unnd ist frolich in dem das er kan und murret nit, das er nit reden kan. Ein hund springt frolich und ist zufriden ob er nit vornunfftig ist.

> Un oysillon s'esjougit et se contente en ce qu'il ha, et n'est point marry qu'il ne scet point parler. Un chien saultelle et se monstre joyeux et ne luy desplaist point qu'il n'a point de raison.

The great French reformers, Jacques Lefèvre himself, were in close sympathy with Luther. They drew from his spirit, his clarity of expression, his profound experience.

> Whilst familiarising himself with the thought of Luther, Lefèvre was able to preserve the independence of his own genius.

It was not the Germanic style of Luther that was copied. It was something more subtle and more penetrating. It was his spirit which reinforced the French enthusiasts and gave vigour to their certainty. Direct influence on Marot, Protestant as he was, is difficult to trace. He himself quaintly disclaims the accusation (which may none the less be truth):

> Clement n'est point le nom de Lutheriste
> Ains est le nom (à bien l'interpreter)
> Du plus contraire ennemy de Luther.

But through Briçonnet his protectress, Margaret of Angoulême, was certainly thus influenced. There is the echo of the Erasmus-Luther controversy, too, in her pleasant lines:

> . . . je vous prie que ces fascheux debatz
> D'arbitre franc et liberté laissez
> Aux grand docteurs . . .

Now Clement Marot and the Queen of Navarre have recognized places in the story of French letters and in the evolution of the French language, places as important, perhaps, as those of de Vigny or Heredia. It must be remembered, too, that before the Reformation the difference between the French and German speaking areas was not a difference accentuated by fierce nationalist hatreds, as it is, alas, to-day.

> The accounts of travellers, the private letters, show that in France there was a lively interest in the Germans as such. German pamphlets prove the existence, on the other side of the Rhine, of a similar curiosity regarding the French.

Until the 16th century there was in fact hardly such a thing as a French or a German nationalist literature.

> We must not forget how much Europe in the 15th cent. was still one single fatherland, whose common language, Latin, allowed cultured people to travel freely and to make themselves understood everywhere.

German and French were still little more than vernacular dialects, which is precisely the reason why the Reformers, who appealed to the common people, wrote in them. By a curious but inevitable irony this vernacular appeal led to the transforming of the dialects into literary instruments of high calibre, and thus the Reformers, in helping to create two great modern literary languages, helped unwittingly to forward the formation of nationalist groups which cut across the international evangel that they were preaching. For you cannot write on great and eternal themes in a dialect without raising that dialect, at any rate temporarily, to the level of a literary language. If the group of men who use that dialect as a literary medium should come to dominate the thought of their period for a sufficiently long time and over a sufficiently wide area, then that language is likely to attain permanence and fixity. And the existence of such a great literary language soon implies the existence of a group of human beings trained to think with the emphases and stresses, the ideas and ideals, embodied and perpetuated in the classical writings and the noblest books of that language.

In the third part of the work Mr. Moore enquires whether it is possible to trace the influence of Luther in the great contemporary prose writers,

in Rabelais and in Calvin. We are so accustomed to think in compartments that I experienced a shock when I came on the first name. Rabelais is literature, Luther is religion ! But real life is not like that. Rabelais's life lay between 1500-1553, so that he must have had contacts with the Reformers.

> He seems to have passed a part of the years 1528-1530 in Paris, and this was a singularly active period in the history of the Reform. In the course of the year 1530 he was in Montpellier, where the diffusion of Lutheran writings had been taking place since 1527; finally if we consider only the works which he published in Lyons in the years 1532-4, we shall be able to estimate to what extent he must have been involved in the intellectual life of that cosmopolitan city.

In this part of the field Mr. Moore is not the earliest researcher; he builds here on the work of many others. The general result seems to be that whether Rabelais knew German or not, he was undoubtedly touched and influenced by the great fundamental ideas of Luther, which were then being widely discussed throughout France. It is difficult not to find echoes of these ideas in the famous prayer of Pantagruel before his battle with Loupgarou :

> Donc, s'il te plaist à cest heure m'estre en aide, comme *en toy seul est ma totalle confiance et espoir,* je te fais voeu que, par toutes contrées tant de ce pays d'Utopie que d'ailleurs, où j'auray puissance et auctorite, *je feray prescher ton sainct Evangile, purement, simplement et entierement,* si que les abus d'un tas de papelars et faulx prophetes, qui ont par *constitutions humaines et inventions depravées* envenimè tout le monde, seront d'entour moy exterminez.
>
> Alors feut ouye une voix de ciel, disant, Hoc fac et vinces.

It is at least very likely that the educational ideals of Luther, which we had occasion recently to discuss in these pages, profoundly influenced Rabelais. Although by no means certain, it would be reasonable to suppose

> that Rabelais had read very carefully what Luther had written about education. He who is acquainted with the conflict and the variety of theories concerning education in the 16th cent. will understand the full implication of this conclusion. If the influence of Luther on the most celebrated chapters of Gargantua could be established, his importance as an educator would be seen in a new light.

I could wish to have pursued this subject further, but perhaps enough has been said to show how completely our author has immersed himself in the world of the 16th century. A popular poet is so steeped in Lutheran thought that he has to defend himself in verse against the charge of being a Lutheran. The greatest lady of the court is translating the professor of Wittenberg, and the greatest prose-writer of the age, some say of any age, appears perhaps as a popularizer of the Lutheran ideals of spiritual freedom, of individual independence and responsibility, of the new education, of the real relation of the community to liberty and personality. "The intellectual effort of the Middle Ages", says Strachey,

> had very rarely clothed itself in an artistic literary form. Men laughed or wept in the poetry or prose of their own tongue; but they thought in scholastic Latin. The union was accomplished by Rabelais. Rabelais's book is the incarnation of the great reaction of his epoch against the superstitious gloom and the narrow asceticism of the Middle Ages. He proclaims, in his rich re-echoing voice, a new conception of the world; he denies that it is the vale of sorrows envisioned by the teachers of the past; he declares that it is abounding in glorious energy, abounding in splendid hope, and, by its very nature, good.

The second book about which it was proposed to speak a little is Dr.

Albert Schweitzer's long awaited *The Mysticism of the Apostle Paul.* We travel back 1500 years in thought from the time of Luther and Rabelais to the 1st century, and we cross Europe from the Rhineland to the Ægean coast cities. Instead of German and French in a nascent state we are now dealing with documents in two even then very old literary languages, Greek and Hebrew. And whereas Mr. Moore attempts to trace the influence of a single genius on many other minds, Dr. Schweitzer is concerned to discover what elements were combined in the thought of his genius and whence they were derived. The former studies the *effect* of Luther's thought, the latter the *origins* and the exact *make-up* of Paul's. Thus the two books form a remarkable contrast in several ways.

My own interest in Dr. Schweitzer's new book is heightened by the fact that he was actually writing it when we met him in his home in the Black Forest in August last year. I had the advantage at that time of reading the opening chapter in his own MS. For, in spite of his belief in the active life, he is as enthusiastic as he ever was about the necessity for scholarship and research. In fact I approached him regarding the position taken up by so many ministers and theological students to-day that scholarly research is a useless waste of time, and that most of the work done in theological colleges—the linguistic work in particular—is irrelevant and helps not at all to fit a man for the ministerial vocation. Dr. Schweitzer —he who gave up the scholar-life to be a very practical builder and surgeon in the primeval forest—was emphatic against this sort of talk. "The *asses,* Naish", he declared, "of course they *must* go through the linguistic and historical work ! We all did it. They must do it too".

And he not only is quite firmly convinced of the necessity of scholarship. He himself still works intensely hard at highly technical historical problems during his vacations in Europe. He has, in fact, been working at them and thinking about them through his years of seclusion in the busy depths of African forests. He refuses *in toto* to lend any support to the prevalent notion that the only mental equipment required by the modern parson is a little psychology, and a little (less) economics; though of both these he knows a good deal !

The well-known critical works which made him famous amongst the theologians—*The Quest of the Historical Jesus* and *Paul and his Interpreters*—were in reality preliminary studies for the present book. In the first of these, it will be remembered, he reviewed the history of the attempts made during more than a century of liberal Protestant scholarship to clear the historical figure of Jesus from the accretions of legend. The conclusion he reaches is often, unfortunately, quoted at second or third hand and woefully misunderstood. It is that Jesus did actually share the belief of the writers of *Daniel* and *Enoch* that a catastrophic ending of the present world-order was at hand, in which the righteous should be saved and glorified and the wicked doomed. He identified Himself with the Son of Man in *Daniel* and the Suffering Servant of *Isa.* 53, and finally went deliberately to His own death because He was led to believe that only thus, in the forcordained divine economy, could the coming of the Kingdom be brought about.

From these results it followed that when Dr. Schweitzer came to make a similar study of the history of Pauline interpretation through the liberal radicalism of Baur and Holtzmann up to the present day, he was led to a similar conclusion regarding the belief of the earliest disciples in general and of Paul in particular. The great apostle, he declares in *Paul and his Interpreters,* is not to be understood as an eclectic, combining Hellenist philosophy or "mystery" religion with belief in the Jewish Messiah. No,

Paul, too, understood Jesus as Jesus had understood Himself, eschatologically. But with a difference. For Paul was a trained Rabbinic scholar and therefore his eschatology took on a more complicated form. Moreover for Jesus Himself His own death was in the future. For Paul it was in the past.

The present volume, then, is a natural sequel to the other two. It follows the same line of reasoning and relies on the same evidence. Far from giving up the eschatological solution, it builds on this, assumes it as a basis. But here a distinction. Whereas the eschatology of our Lord Himself was that of *Daniel* and *Enoch,* the eschatology of Paul was not of this, the popular, type, but of the sophisticated or scholarly type which we find in *Baruch* and *IV Ezra.* The first type only anticipated one single crisis and cataclysm coinciding with the arrival of the Kingdom and the vanishing of the old, and coming of the new, heaven and earth. The second type looked for two crises. The first crisis would usher in a millennial intermediate period after which the second resurrection would take place and the eternal Kingdom of righteousness and bliss would begin. Not only did Paul hold this second more complicated view, but he was further obliged to modify the eschatology of *Baruch* and *IV Ezra* because for him, of course, the death and resurrection of Jesus had necessarily closed the old *régime.* We *are actually in* the Messianic period here and now, although this is hidden from all but the elect until the return of Jesus in glory, which event may take place at any time. Consequently, to employ Dr. Schweitzer's brilliant image, Paul felt himself and his fellow Christians to be in the position of an audience after the curtain has gone down, listening to the faint sounds of scene-shifting and momentarily expectant of its rising on the next act. Or, to quote another of his similes, whereas death and resurrection lay for Jesus like mountains on the horizon ahead, Paul had already crossed the first passes and from the middle of the range looked back on the earlier peaks. What then is the connexion of all this eschatological phantasy with the Christ-life of love and joy and peace in which Paul himself lived, and which he preached so eloquently to his fellow-saints? It is just here that, to me at least, Dr. Schweitzer's interpretation does seem to fit and to explain so many otherwise obscure expressions in Paul's epistles. (Others may not be similarly impressed. But read the book.) Since Jesus' death and resurrection had obviously taken place, yet, just as obviously, the world remained to outward view unaffected; *where* then could the change have happened which certainly must have happened *somewhere* ? The answer is, in the interior lives of the saints. The cruder early Christians shared with Jesus the simpler eschatology. Two beliefs, in consequence, they held firmly, (1) that Jesus had attained Messiahship through His own death, (2) that He had won by that same death forgiveness of sins for those who belong to Him. These beliefs are, in fact, the creed of the earliest believers, who, of course, were already either Jews or Jewish proselytes. But what is the connexion of these two facts of salvation—the exalted Messiahship of Jesus and the forgiveness of sins which comes *through* His death and resurrection? Paul, as a trained thinker, could not rest until he had worked out the *how* of these two facts. And his mystic teaching regarding the partaking of the saints in the body of the Risen Lord is his solution of the problem. The saints—Christ's own—partake in His death and resurrection and are part of His mystic resurrection body. To be "in Christ" is only a shortened expression meaning exactly the same thing as being partakers in His body, and therefore also, in His resurrection life. By contrast the unsaved are even described as being "in the Law". Paul then is a Jew and partakes

the eschatological views of the Jewish scholars who wrote *Baruch* and *IV Ezra*. But again with a difference. For him the Messiah had already come, and those who follow Him have already passed with Him from death unto life.

Such in brief is the argument of this remarkable work. To those of us who hold that Paul (together with the *N.T.* in general) is only to be really understood through the study of the *O.T.*, and that therefore Hebrew and Aramaic scholarship are really still keys to the mysteries of the faith, even more, not less, than they were to the 18th century divines, this conclusion cannot but be highly cheering. That such a piece of erudition should have been worked out by an expert surgeon in the intervals of his strenuous battle against disease amongst primitive negro clans, is an encouragement to those who believe in sound learning. For those, if any, who wonder how such a historical interpretation can go with a practical faith in Christ, we would point to the living faith of Dr. Schweitzer himself. It can, it does! For those, if any, who would deny the fact because it does not accord with their notion of what the theory should be—for those, if any, who would deny the Christ-faith and life in Dr. Schweitzer because his interpretation of the *N.T.* differs from theirs—well, these pages, dear ones, are not written for you! At all events, Dr. Schweitzer's life is proof positive that the most radical scholarship is no bar, but, by clearing the way for sincerity, may be actually a help, to that partaking of the mystic body of Christ in which Albert Schweitzer believes, and which he shares in daily practice with the great apostle, and with the humblest of the early disciples.

J. P. Naish.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

" Read not to contradict and confute, nor to believe and take for granted, nor to find talk and discourse, but to weigh and consider."—FRANCIS BACON.

" A good book is the precious life-blood of a master spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life."—JOHN MILTON.

(*The place of publication is London, and the date* 1930 *unless otherwise stated.*)

Treatise on the Gods. By H. L. MENCKEN. Knopf. 10s. 6d.

People in America whose opinions we respect tell us that Mr. H. L. Mencken is a back number who no longer counts with the youthful intelligentsia who for a time took great delight in him. It may be an indication of the truth of this judgment that he was not mentioned once at Bournemouth for twenty times Mr. Lippmann was quoted, and certainly nobody reading this book will wonder at the position to which he has been relegated. At times amusing and skittish, the book often becomes cheap and occasionally nasty; sometimes we have clever fooling which merely makes us sorry for the writer. Anything more facile, superficial, and misleading than the account of the 18th century as the Golden Age we have rarely read.

Mr. Mencken, in his criticism of religion, invariably turns to aspects of it which are most vulnerable—to superstitious Romanism, or to the political Methodism, which is his *bête noire;* we have not noticed a single mention of Congregationalism, which surely Mr. Mencken must have met. To him religion has as

> its single function . . . to give access to the powers which seem to control his (man's) destiny and its single purpose to induce those powers to be friendly to him.

It was probably invented by the priests, who also invented immortality to give them more power.

> It is Hell, of course, that makes priests powerful, . . . for after thousands of years of so-called civilization fear remains the one common denominator of mankind . . . When men cease to fear the gods they cease to be religious in any rational sense. Nevertheless, to-day no really civilized man or woman believes in the cosmogony of *Genesis,* nor in the reality of Hell, nor in any of the other imbecilities that still entertain the mob . . . One seldom discovers a true believer who is worth knowing.

Faced with scientists like Eddington and Millikan, Mr. Mencken replies that they have never escaped their early religious training, while theologians not merely "as a class dislike scientists as a class", but

> all of us, indeed, who have ever come to close quarters with theologians must have left them with an elated feeling that our sort of decency was a great deal better than theirs. For they are not, as a class, fair men, nor is there any noticeable honesty in them.

Altogether Mr. Mencken seems to have been particularly unfortunate in the people he has met; and that his acquaintance has been very limited is shown by the fact that he thinks it is difficult to find a sect which does not practise fasting! That his knowledge is equally limited may be gauged from the fact that he calls the Renaissance

immensely curious, ingenious, sceptical and daring—in brief, everything that Christianity was not.

Is anything more venturous than the faith that is central to Christianity? And has Mr. Mencken never seen it in action?

But perhaps no words give Mr. Mencken's measure better than his own Preface:

> I have paid relatively little attention to the ethical aspect of religion, for I am convinced that that aspect is largely fortuitous. Men simply credit to the gods whatever laws they evolve out of their own wisdom or lack of it. Religion itself is something quite different; it is primarily a theory of causes and only incidentally a scheme of conduct. My own private code of ethics, I like to think, is superior to that of most Christians, but there is no more religion in it than there is in my *principia* of æsthetics . . . Religion can be very swinish, but that swinishness is surely not of its essence. What brought it unto the world was man's eternal wonder and his eternal hope. It represents one of his bold efforts—and perhaps not the least of them—to penetrate the unknowable, to put down the intolerable, to re-fashion the universe nearer to his heart's desire. My belief is that it is a poor device to that end—that when it is examined objectively it testifies to his imbecility quite as much as to his high striving.

EDITOR.

England. By WILHELM DIBELIUS. Cape. 15s.

This is an extremely difficult book to assess, though it is a pleasant book to read, despite its length. As a study of our national character and institutions by one who cannot have the "feel" of things possible to an insider, it is a remarkable *tour-de-force*. It is amazing, for example, how much Professor Dibelius has been able to learn about the details of British administration, and how skilfully he has worked all his facts together to make a very readable book. He is a candid critic, too, with a sharp eye for our weaknesses—our dislike of systematic thought, our cant, and our love of comfort—and a careful examination of his strictures should serve as a stimulating tonic. On weak spots in our political life, too, he puts an unerring finger, as when he speaks of those "merely useful things for which no Prime Minister has time".

Nevertheless, it is impossible to be satisfied with the book, and especially with the section devoted to religion. We are conscious throughout that the book is behind the times: the translation is made from the revised 5th German edition, yet the basis is the original edition of 1922, and events have moved very rapidly in recent years—would anyone now, *e.g.*, hold that "Society" plays the part in British politics which Professor Dibelius gives to it?

We should be prepared to contest the statement about the Puritan "hatred of the arts", and the contention that the rule of the Puritans (1640-1660) "killed the English theatre and English music". Dr. Dibelius might learn something from Dr. Orlando Mansfield's recent article in our pages.

Among other points where the observer seems to go astray are the following:—

P. 311, "barristers are almost all from the good families".

P. 347, "The primacy of the Anglican Church is contested, bitterly, by all Dissenters, but it exists in practically undiminished force", while the Nonconformists, we are told, "are united in one point only . . . the struggle against the Established Church" (p. 368).

On p. 356, James Martineau is called a "Broad Churchman", and on p. 382 we learn that "the whole Sunday-school system derives from Wesley".

On p. 413 the dates in regard to Manchester and Mansfield Colleges seem to have gone astray.

We doubt, too, if the Quakers would accept Dr. Dibelius's account of them, while we think that "the deeply-rooted assumption of the faithful Puritan that the English people, despite certain smirches on its escutcheon, is, after all, chosen by God and designed by Him for lordship" exists only in the writer's imagination.

On the whole, Mrs. Hamilton's translation is readable, though it stumbles in places. She is very fond of the word "banausic", and there are some other unusual expressions. There is a misprint on p. 393 and several in the bibliographies.

We should not like readers to gather from these comments that the book is not well worth their attention. As a survey its main outlines are clear and, we think, accurate: that the details are incorrect is due to the distance of the observer from his object. We cannot think of anyone in this country capable of writing an account of Germany anything like so good. EDITOR.

A Cultural History of the Modern Age. By EGON FRIEDELL. Vol. I. Knopf. 21s.

Herr Friedell, who is evidently inspired by Spengler, is covering the period from the Black Death to the Great War in three volumes. Two volumes have appeared in German, and now we have Mr. C. F. Atkinson's translation of Vol. I, which contains "Introduction" and "Renaissance and Reformation", and brings the *History* down to 1618. The volume is dedicated to Mr. Bernard Shaw, whom Herr Friedell calls "the strongest and warmest brain of our own times".

The attitude of this school represents a reaction against the scientific method of writing history. Herr Friedell says:

> What this book attempts to tell is no more and no less than *to-day's legend of modern history.*
>
> We often find in the preface to a learned work some such remark as this: " Completeness, as far as possible, has naturally been my aim throughout; it is for my respected colleagues to decide whether I have left any gaps ". Now my own standpoint is the exact opposite. Quite apart from the fact that I should not dream of letting my respected colleagues decide anything whatever, I am inclined to say that incompleteness, as far as possible, has been my aim throughout.

Again,

> In short, the *anecdote* in all its implications appears to me as the only art-form one may justifiably use in writing cultural history.

After this we are not surprised to read that "the age is absolutely and entirely the creation of its great man", and we can begin to speculate on what things will be omitted from the incomplete history.

Herr Friedell's method may be deduced from his treatment of the Black Death. Having decided that 1348 was "the year in which modern man was conceived", for "disease is something productive" and "wherever something new is being formed there is weakness, sickness, and 'decadence' ", his sub-sections are headed thus:

> Beginning of the excursus on the value of sickness.
> The healthiest being is the amœba.
> All that is becoming is decadent.
> Higher value of organs in lowered condition.
> Health is, therefore, a metabolism-sickness.

The Lernæan Hydra.
The Achilles out of the heel.
The survival of the unfit
Genius is never healthy.
Genius is never sick.
The threefold division of mankind.
Production as a refuge.

It is all very interesting, but is it history? And does it inspire confidence?

EDITOR.

The Hittite Empire. By JOHN GARSTANG, M.A., D.Sc. Constable. 25s.

"I can feel no doubt", says Walter Leaf in his *Troy* (1912) "that the *Iliad* is based on a very solid foundation of historical fact". Leaf was a delicate and beautiful scholar, and his opinion has received fresh confirmation now that the story of the Hittites is being steadily pieced together. The present book is a re-writing of the author's previous volume, *The Land of the Hittites* (1910). It is an extraordinarily full and careful setting forth of the geographical details and of the known Hittite remains from the point of view of the excavator and explorer of sites. Photographs and sketches are lavishly provided. But it might have been better to have retained the old title. The historical sketch in the first three chapters follows that of the late Dr. Hogarth in *C.A.H.* fairly closely. Hogarth was an exact documentary scholar of the finest calibre and a first class classic to boot.

For documentary information we are still indebted to the group of German and Austrian investigators who have worked so devotedly on the Boghaz-keui tablets since their discovery by Winckler in 1907. Amongst these, Friedrich Hrozny of Vienna and Emil Forrer of Berlin are supreme. It is a revelation to read the patient work of Hrozny and Weidner in *Boghaz-koï Studien,* or the beautifully hand-written lithographs of Forrer's *Forschungen* with his exquisite detailed maps. Prof. Garstang has drawn largely on these sources, as all students of the subject must.

The position at present is well summed up by Albrecht Götze in his little pamphlet *das Hethiter-Reich* (1928). There were three periods of "Hittite" influence. The first was previous to the "Hyksos" and Kassite period, during the second half of the 3rd millennium B.C., and perhaps connects with a period far more remote still, that of the "red-ware" civilization of the first city at Hissarlik, which is probably contemporary with pre-dynastic Egypt. The second is the period (1450-1200 B.C.) of the great Hittite empire in Asia Minor which ends contemporaneously with the fall of Troy. The tablets dealing with this period can be definitely dated, and there was certainly contact with the Achæans and Dardanians. *Cf.* Forrer's translation of a letter from a Hittite king to a Grecian chieftain in 1336 B.C. The third period is perhaps not really "Hittite" at all. To this Syro-"Hittite" culture which centred round Carchemish (Jerablus) in the 9th-8th century B.C. we find sufficient reference in Assyrian sources, but otherwise must rely on purely archæological evidence, and a number of unread documents in the shape of pictographic inscriptions, which, in spite of the work of a line of scholars beginning with Conder and ending with Cowley, still defy the decipherer as completely as do those of Crete and Etruria.

Götze's view of the later Carchemish culture is as follows :

> The Hittite element gives little more than the name and the political tradition; what remains is to be considered and understood in connection with Syrian developments.

For the rest it is difficult to place such weight on undiscriminated references in the *O.T.* as do Capt. Woolley and Prof. Garstang. The brilliant archæologist who is not also a trained linguistic and documentary scholar is apt to ignore the need for testing the exact value of the documentary stratum from which any particular Biblical passage, which he is using as evidence, may be derived.

J. P. Naish.

Hebrew Religion: Its Origin and Development. By W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D., and T. H. Robinson, D.D. S.P.C.K. 10s. 6d.

We have a delightful memory of Prof. Oesterley playing Red Indians with two children on a glorious midsummer evening in a Lancashire garden. Is that perhaps the way in which he gets to know so much about the primitive mind? A picture comes to us, too, of a road leading from Mussoorie to Landour on another evening during the Indian hot-weather, and of Dr. Robinson and his family suddenly encountered coming round a bend in it. And have I not often heard him say that only an ex-Indian missionary can adequately interpret the *O.T.*? Certain it is that these two well-known scholars have produced what they set out to produce—an admirably concise, sound, and yet comprehensive text-book for the ordinary theological student and the working minister. It is divided into three parts. Dr. Oesterley first deals with the primitive background, which, like couch-grass in the soil of a wheat-field, underlies all religious thought and practice of more advanced types. Secondly, Prof. Robinson sketches the main lines of pre-exilic development. Thirdly, the complicated phenomena of post-exilic Judaism are dealt with by a partnership effort. The book follows, on the whole, the general consensus of sane and moderate scholarship to-day. (There *is* such a consensus, in spite of mockers!) It puts into simple and comprehensible form the juice of more learned and less easily readable books like Gray's *Sacrifice* or Robertson Smith's *Religion of the Semites*.

Naturally every specialist reviewer will find it possible to suggest other emphases or shiftings of points of view in dealing with a period so vast where the evidence is so scanty and often susceptible of various interpretations. It is interesting, for example, to see how the idea that a monotheist and puritan tendency is inherent peculiarly in Semitic language and traditions, and that it derives from the nomad life, is giving way and vanishing before the accumulation of facts to the contrary. Renan wrote in 1887 (*Hist. du peuple d'Isr.*, p. 45) *Avec un certain type de langue . . . semble donc tout d'abord avoir eu en partage un certain type de religion. Tout cela tint principalement . . . à ce genre de vie nomade.* Prof. Robinson has moved away noticeably from this position even since he published his *Prophecy and the Prophets* in 1923. The canonical prophets themselves held this theory regarding the desert origin of ethical monotheism. But is it history? By David's time the "Israelites" of the central *massif* were surely predominantly Canaanite in blood. And how far did the Judaites exist as Yahwists and united patriots before David drew them together and civilized them? Did not Abner refer to David himself as a "measly Bedouin"—a petty Calibbite chieftain? We cannot help suspecting the validity of the remnants of Renan's desert theory. We ought not to forget that most of the Hebrew evidence comes to us from a period subsequent to the capture of Jerusalem and the establishment there of a strong body of Yahwist priests. The struggles of this shrine with those

of the central *massif* seem to have coloured a great deal of the literature in the form in which it has come down to us; it has been repeatedly re-edited in the interests of the eventual victors. The views of Prof. Kennett regarding the priesthood (*O.T. Essays*), of Dr. S. A. Cook regarding the critical 6th century period (*C.A.H.*), and of Prof. Hölscher regarding the origin of the Moses legends, would seem to be relevant here. So much of the post-exilic phenomena only appears after propaganda initiated in Babylonia had had its effect. The Jews of the post-exile are extraordinarily different from the Israelites of the pre-exile. Whence came the well-known Armenoid features of the latter? It is here suggested that the post-exilic sabbath is a development of the pre-exilic festival of the same name. But Eissfeldt (*Die Rel. in Gesch. u. Gegenw.*, pp. 550 ff.) and Benzinger (*Hebr. Archäol.* [2], p. 380) both derive the former from Babylonia, Eissfeldt dealing satisfactorily with the difficulties here considered insuperable.

A distinction is carefully drawn, as is usual to-day, between popular religion in the pre-exile and that of the religious leaders. But how far were the pre-exilic canonical prophets ever regarded as religious leaders in their own time, except by numerically insignificant bands of disciples? We do not know. And if few people follow a man can he be regarded as having been leader of the nation in his lifetime?

Again, we should like more light on the axiom that a god has individuality—a spirit has not. What is individuality, anyway, and how far does such a notion exist at all in the pre-exile? If it does so in any measure, can it be denied to spirit? Following a famous Oxford teacher of a past generation, we "do not like these absolute distinctions". The discussion of *revenants* and the whole question of necromancy is titillating. The present writer has long been inclined to emend *I Sam.* 10^{12} so as to read "but who are their controls?". The ephod and the ark are also interesting objects. Can the latter really belong to the desert period? Is it not at least significant that Egyptian *sistra* and Isis-necklaces accompanied the ark on its way to Jerusalem, whilst Phinehas is undoubtedly a good late Egyptian name (pā'-nhsī)? Isis and Nephthys sit at each end of the sarcophagus lid of the lady Taba on the Carpentras stele, whilst *'aron* undoubtedly means coffin in the Tabnith inscription. Can the ark have contained the mummified corpse of the dead leader, assassinated at the Jordan fords? How come cuneiform inscribed tablets inside it? And where did it hide itself during the succeeding period of (it would seem) 200 years at least? That such "strong medicine" should have been so long utterly neglected seems strange.

We should like also to question Dr. Oesterley's apparent assumption that there was only one type of orthodox Judaism in the later post-exile, and that the Mishnaic. What of Bousset's argument regarding the creative effect of the Maccabean struggle? It would appear from the existence of such books as *Ben Sira* and *Wisdom* that there were many tints and shades of Judaism. That Greek-speaking Judaism which so astonishingly disappears from history in the 2nd century A.D. has yet to be adequately investigated. There was a popular, as well as a learned type of eschatology, even in Palestine. Would every pious Jew have allowed the claim of the Rabbinic way of faith to be normative? Such are some of the questions which rise spontaneously in the mind, amongst very many others which lack of space forbids us to mention.

J. P. Naish.

The Commentary of . . Kimhi on Hosea. Edited by H. COHEN, Ph.D. Columbia Univ. Press. 10s. 6d.

The O.T. in Greek. Edited by A. E. BROOKE, N. MCCLEAN, and H. ST. J. THACKERAY. Vol. II, Pt. II, I and II Kings. Cambridge Univ. Press. 20s.

Sumerian Contracts from Nippur. By G. R. HUNTER, M.A., D.Phil. Oxford Univ. Press. 12s.

Dr. *Harry* Cohen edits this medieval Hebrew commentary and publishes it from a very modern American university! One of my own students was reading Rashi recently and came across a French word in the Hebrew, of course in Hebrew characters. It puzzled him for a while. Then it took him back with a jump to Troyes in the eleventh century. "There is", says Abrahams, "a quaintness and fascination about [Rashi] which are lacking in the pedantic sobriety of Ibn Ezra and the grammatical exactness of Kimchi". Dr. Cohen, nevertheless, has done a useful piece of work, if highly specialist, in showing how Kimhi had absorbed all the learning of the centuries of Spanish Judaism preceding him. We hope that he will be able eventually to publish his translation of the present text.

The Cambridge *LXX* has got as far as *Kings*. The editors are to be congratulated on another excellent and thorough piece of work, based mainly on B, as was of course inevitable. *N.T.* students should be grateful, for it is more and more certain that they will be compelled to add a careful study of the *LXX* to their papyrus lore if they wish really to grasp the nuances of "Hellenistic" Greek.

Mr. Hunter's main work for his Oxford D.Phil. degree was done on the seal inscriptions, *etc.*, found at Mohenjo Daro and Harappa in the Indus Valley. The present texts have been translated by him from tablets purchased in Mesopotamia by Prof. Langdon. Whether the small band of Sumerian students will be able to establish a connexion between their own documents and the upper layers at Susa and Anau, discovered by De Morgan and the Pumpelly expeditions, together with the Mohenjo Daro stuff dug out by Sir J. Marshall, remains to be seen. The present tablets establish the existence of a literary and commercial civilization in Mesopotamia well into the third millennium B.C. But that we knew previously. A capital set of plates is included.

J. P. NAISH.

The Gospel According to St. Luke. The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes and Indices. By JOHN MARTIN CREED, B.D. Macmillan. 15s.

"The most beautiful book in the world" has received no little attention of late years. Besides the new consideration given to it (and especially to its sources) by Canon Streeter, Dr. Vincent Taylor, and Dr. Cadbury, we have the Commentary by Dr. B. S. Easton, and that by Mr. Balmforth in the admirable "Clarendon Bible" series. But no one who is familiar with the Ely Professor's scholarly contributions to the *Journal of Theological Studies* will need the assurance that in the study of Luke's Gospel which he has now published we have a distinct acquisition to the literature of the subject. It is a pleasure to note the continued association of the firm of Macmillan with Cambridge New Testament scholarship which began in the days of Lightfoot and Westcott. Those were the days of the Epistles; now with Swete on *Mark* and Professor McNeile on *Matthew*, and the

volume before us, to say nothing of Dr. Montefiore, the Synoptic Gospels have been covered, and we may hope for *the* Commentary on the Fourth Gospel.

Mr. Creed began his work at the suggestion of Swete, and a comparison of it with that scholar's work on *Mark* shows how Synoptic studies have advanced during the last thirty years. While there is the same meticulous scholarship and the same far-reaching acquaintance with classical and patristic literature, there is a new atmosphere which Swete never breathed. One strong element in it is the work of Strack and Billerbeck; another is represented by the names of Bultmann and Schmidt, and, though Mr. Creed has his own opinion about the *Formgeschichte* theories associated with these latter names, he pays a genuine tribute to their investigations. With the "Proto-Luke" theory of Streeter and Taylor, which has been making some headway of late, he is not in accord, and very little reference is made to it. Instead of the surmise that Luke put Marcan material into his own and Q, he inclines to the position that Luke put Q and his own material into Marcan. His pages on Luke's treatment of *Mark* (especially with reference to the "great omission" and the Passion) are very persuasive, and his observations on Luke's new type of narrative and of parable are fresh and suggestive.

On questions of authorship and date, Mr. Creed finds Luke to be a companion of Paul; the tradition that he was a physician is not so much proved or disproved as confirmed by modern research. There is no dependence on Josephus, and the date is perhaps ten or fifteen years after 70 A.D. The writing is not "tendencious" and there is no "Paulinism." While the idea of the Parousia is still present, it is less imminent than in *Mark*. Jesus is the Christ foretold by prophecy, and as Messiah is Son of God. This Sonship is carried back to the Birth, but there is no notion of pre-existence.

Mr. Creed (rightly, as I think) ascribes the Magnificat to Elizabeth, and is unconvinced by the argument of Sir W. M. Ramsay as to the census. He thinks Luke has transferred the well-known census of Quirinius A.D. 6 or 7 to a date ten or eleven years before it actually occurred. Luke's history is not always dependable (*cf.* the Theudas allusion in *Acts* 5, the narrative of Pentecost, and the story of the Jerusalem Council in *Acts* 15, which we can only equate with *Gal.* 2 at the expense of Luke's historic accuracy). Thus the Nazareth incident (4^{16-30}) is a free sketch "on the basis of traditional material" whose function is to introduce the main *motifs* of the Gospel and *Acts;* "the Gospel to the poor is preached by Jesus in His own home and rejected," a foreshadowing of its rejection by the Jews and its promulgation among the Gentiles. This latter is symbolized in the narrative of 5^{1-11}, a story very similar to that of *John* 21, where possibly its more original form is to be found.

There are certain test passages to which one naturally turns in examining a new commentary. Amongst those in *Luke* are 1^{34f}, 3^{21-23}, 11^{49}, 12^{49f}, 13^{32f}. Mr. Creed does not fail us in any of these. His detailed comment, no less than the surveys prefixed to each section and the welcome "Additional Notes" at the end of the volume, are marked by knowledge, clarity, candour, and sympathy. The book is eminently readable, and that not only by the expert; and, like Luke himself, Mr. Creed has made it just about the right length. We note that Eichhorn has dropped an h on p. 30, and that at the top of p. xv (*Acts XVI*) 7 should be 17.

Alex. J. Grieve.

The Fullness of Sacrifice; An Essay in Reconciliation. By F. C. N. Hicks, D.D. Macmillan. 15s.

It should be stated at once that this is a really important book on the Atonement, which must command attention from all who are interested in the restatement of the doctrine. It strikes out a new line of approach to the subject, and exhibits a marked originality of treatment throughout.

The leading idea of the work is that our Lord Himself and the *New Testament* writers lived and taught in an atmosphere of sacrificial religion. Sacrifice was to them not something remote or to be painfully reconstructed by archæological study: it was a reality that dominated the world in which they lived. Its *technique* was familiar to them, and its meaning was plain and evident to their minds.

It was of course the sacrificial system of the *Old Testament* with which they were so well acquainted. The belief of Bishop Hicks is that modern research has made the meaning of that system clear to us also, so that we are able to reproduce the atmosphere of the *New Testament* writings in a way that the Church has been unable to do since the fourth Christian century. Then it was that sacrifice passed out of the general background of the Christian consciousness, so that some comprehension of its meaning was only preserved in the tradition as to the significance of the Cross and of the Eucharist. But Jewish sacrifice had ceased; and the Church had overcome paganism, so that it entered upon a new world where the notion of sacrifice was no longer a commonplace. The true idea of the Christian sacrifice lingered in the East, but Latin Christianity, and especially Medieval Latin Christianity, committed a fatal mistake in limiting the idea of Christ's sacrifice to His death and in understanding that in too negative a way, not as a transition to life, but as a destruction of being. This mistaken idea of Christ's death was inherited by the Reformers, but it continued equally in Tridentine Catholicism. The result was that all the controversies between Protestants and Catholics about the sacrificial value of the Eucharist were vitiated from the beginning. They centred in the question whether the Sacrifice of Christ was offered once for all upon the Cross, or whether the sacrifice of the Cross was represented in the Eucharist. The question thus stated was wrongly stated and could lead to no satisfactory answer. A deadlock was reached, which still continues.

What has Bishop Hicks to suggest to relieve the situation? He turns to the *Old Testament* and the Jewish sacrificial system. He thinks that modern scholarship (mostly Protestant) has gone too far in its predilection for the prophet at the expense of the priest. It remains for scholarship with Catholic presuppositions to restore the balance.

There are in the *Old Testament* two fundamental conceptions of God. God is the Holy One and He is the Righteous King. The former represents the *numinous* element, and the latter the *ethical* element. The former belongs to the priest, the latter to the prophet. Bishop Hicks refuses to believe that the prophets ever rejected the sacrificial system. But he thinks that, taken alone, they tend to produce that one-sided emphasis on righteousness which culminated in the Pharisaic doctrine of merit and which so distressed St. Paul. The Bishop advances the paradox that grace is more a priestly than a prophetic element in Jewish religion: it means the self-communication of the Divine holiness and is bestowed through the whole sacrificial system.

Dr. Hicks enumerates the parts of sacrifice as six: (1) the approach or "drawing near" to God; (2) the identification of the offerer with the victim by the laying on of hands; (3) the slaying of the victim by the offerer; (4)

the sprinkling of the blood on the altar by the priest; (5) the burning or sublimation of the flesh; (6) in sacrifices other than burnt offerings, the communion meal.

These points constitute what Bishop Hicks calls the *technique* of sacrifice. In interpreting their meaning he follows principally Robertson Smith. The death of the victim is not an end in itself: its object is to procure the blood which is the life. The conveyance of this blood to God by sprinkling the altar and the offering of the flesh to Him by burning establish communion (as blood-brotherhood) between Him and the offerer in one direction, while the eating of the communion meal establishes it in the reverse direction. So far as there is propitiation through sacrifice, it is not specifically through the death: it is properly through the blood which is the life—it is this which makes At-one-ment (*Lev.* 17^{11}).

All this is now applied to the *New Testament.* The Bishop admits that the Synoptic Gospels furnish the crucial test of the theory he wishes to propound. He insists on the "numinous" element in the Synoptic Christianity. The God of Jesus is transcendent: the salvation he brings —eternal life—is equally transcendent. He Himself is "numinous": it is impossible to reduce Him simply to the level of a prophet. His ethical teaching has this numinous background. If at first there seems to be nothing much about sacrifice in it, a closer examination will disclose the very opposite. Not only is Christ's language full of references to the temple and its sacrifices, but the parables of the Lost Sheep and the Good Samaritan, so central in His teaching, show God in Christ redeeming sinners at a cost and feeding them with food sufficient. The "ransom" passage (Mk. 10^{45}) and the institution of the Lord's Supper are all along the same line. Moreover, the latter continues the principle of the apocalyptic meals which Jesus had previously given to the multitudes. His favourite parabolic representation of eternal life also was that of a feast. There seems to have been a Jewish expectation that in the Kingdom of God the blessed would feast on the Messiah Himself, and it is just this that Jesus establishes and confirms in the Last Supper.

Dr. Hicks points out most interestingly how such an understanding of the Synoptics brings us near to the theology of the *Gospel of John,* which accordingly is revealed as the true key to the meaning of the earlier gospels. Space does not allow the pursuit of the Bishop's interpretation through the rest of the *New Testament.* All that is necessary is to bring out two important points. In the first place, in dealing with St. Paul Dr. Hicks shows that for the apostle the death of Christ is never separate from His resurrection: it is no true understanding of the Pauline theology that divides the two. Dr. Forsyth's emphasis on the "Cruciality of the Cross" is right; yet it is not to be understood in the sense that the Cross can be separated from its whole context in the total sacrifice of Christ, which includes His Incarnation, His Passion, His Resurrection, and His heavenly Intercession all in one.

Secondly, the Bishop lays great emphasis on the Pauline doctrine of the Church as the Body of Christ. He reminds us that for the Jew (as for the Catholic) religion was institutional and corporate. The Body of Christ is indwelt by the Spirit, which is Christ's life, and which was liberated by His death. Once more the *Gospel of John* furnishes the key (Jn. 7^{39}).

Thus we come to the conclusions which Dr. Hicks wishes to draw from his discussions. Substantially they are these: they follow the six points fixed concerning *Old Testament* Sacrifice.

(1) The approach to God is through the Incarnation of Christ. By faith in this we "draw near" to God.

(2) Identification with Christ is in Baptism, the sacrament of initiation.

(3) The slaying of Christ is not a priestly act: it was done by the sinners themselves.

(4) On the contrary, Christ as Priest offers up His own liberated life, and the Church joins in the offering in the celebration of the Eucharist.

(5) His life is now in the Spirit, a life in God.

(6) In the Communion Christians are fed with this life and participate in the same Spirit.

Dr. Hicks emphasizes strongly that the Christ who is present in the Eucharist is not Christ crucified, but Christ glorified. If we say that He is Christ crucified, we have no option but either to make the Supper a memorial or to deny the sufficiency of the Passion. But if He is understood to be Christ glorified He is seen to offer Himself up in and with His body in one continuous sacrifice.

A great deal could be said about this book. Indeed a great deal will have to be said and will be said. It is a strong book, logical, coherent, and full of conviction. There is much in it with which one can heartily agree. It is quite right that the sacrifice of Christ means more than His death and that His death can only be understood in the wider context of His whole life-work.

But there are two criticisms which must be made. The first is that the *Old Testament* basis from which Bishop Hicks works is too insecure to bear the weight he puts upon it. It is altogether doubtful whether so complete a *rationale* of sacrifice can be established as the Bishop supposes. Many sound scholars would say that in *New Testament* times, at any rate, the principal idea connected with sacrifice was simply that it was the appointed way of communion with God. Other thoughts connected with it were simply of private provenance and varied from one person to another.

Further, the recent authoritative work on *Old Testament Sacrifice* by Dr. Buchanan Gray tends to the conclusion that so far as there were generally accepted notions in Judaism about the meaning of sacrifice, these were not along the lines of Robertson Smith's communion theory, but rather along those of the gift-theory which both he, and the Bishop following him, treat as secondary.

The second criticism is that the supremacy of the numinous in religion over the ethical, and of the priestly over the prophetic, is a dubious proposition. This is the fundamental issue for a Protestant in dealing with all Catholic theories. It is clearly stated in Luther's assertion that grace is not a quality of the soul, infused or imparted, but is the free favour of God accepted and responded to by faith.

If we substitute the Protestant for the Catholic idea of grace in the Bishop's theory, the change will be revolutionary. We shall come nearer to that moral theory whose austerity he admires in Rashdall's book on the Atonement, but which is far from being, when properly stated, a theory of moral example only. It is a theory of the revelation of the love of God, through Christ's whole life and work indeed, but focused once for all in his great act of self-surrender on the Cross. The effect of this love, the true grace that stoops to the sinner, is first the experience of forgiveness and peace of conscience and then an answering love that is kindled by it in the soul. In the Lord's Supper we have that love set forth in the emblems of Christ's Passion, and Christ is present in His Gospel, which, as Calvin says, is represented in the elements as in a picture. We offer up

the sacrifice not of Christ, but of ourselves through Him, a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving for His love.

Not life but *love* is the supreme word in Christianity. Life is what all religions offer: the peculiarity of Christianity is that it interprets life through love.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

The Quest for Certainty. A Study of the Relation of Knowledge and Action. Gifford Lectures for 1929. By JOHN DEWEY. Allen & Unwin. 10s. 6d.

This volume, in which the doyen of American philosophers of to-day gives us a systematic presentation of positions which he has made peculiarly his own, will be warmly welcomed by readers on both sides of the Atlantic. The writer belongs to the group of radical empiricists who derive their inspiration from William James. On lines of his own, however, he has developed the instrumentalist rather than the pragmatist side of the teaching, and without that lighter touch that made James at once so engaging and so provoking. Dewey emphasizes the function of knowledge as a tool created for the purpose of controlling and directing practical activities. Intelligence is the instrument we use in situations where our first attempts at control have been frustrated. Hence mind or thinking may be defined in terms of response to the doubtful as such. In respect of any subject-matter we know in the degree in which we are able deliberately to resolve doubtful situations. The scientific attitude is one that is capable of enjoying the doubtful and converting it into operations of definite enquiry.

Dewey would replace the spectator theory of knowledge (with its assumption that the object of knowledge is prior to and independent of the operation of knowing) with the theory that is implicit in scientific procedure, according to which knowledge is a process of interaction which "marks the conversion of undirected changes into changes directed towards an intended conclusion". This means that ideas are to be defined in terms of operations to be performed, and that their validity is to be tested by the consequences of these operations. Hence the quest for cognitive certainty, resting upon the exact possession in the mind of immutable reality, is to be exchanged for practical security in the active control of the changing course of events.

For this book the central problem is that of the relation of scientific knowledge to the values that are implicit in ethics and religion. By values we are to understand anything that is taken to have rightful authority in the direction of conduct. How is the realm of values to be conserved in view of beliefs about the nature of things which are due to natural science? This can only be done in so far as knowledge is viewed in the closest possible relation to action. For so long as knowledge is divorced from practice the values with which practical activity is concerned are left with no sure foothold in reality. The experimental method of scientific enquiry shows, however, that knowledge itself is a mode of practical activity, and "all that is required in order to apprehend that scientific knowledge as a mode of active operation is a potential ally of the modes of action which sustain values in existence is to surrender the traditional notion that knowledge is possession of the inner nature of things and is the only way in which they may be experienced as they 'really' are". In the sphere of values as in the sphere of physical science we have to do with the control and direction of acts to be performed.

A situation like that which confronts us to-day, in which there is a general breakdown of authority, demands an experimental empiricism in the field of our moral and social conceptions. All standards, principles, and rules must be regarded as hypothetical instruments to be tested by the consequences effected by acting upon them. Values therefore will not be fixed and immutable, but tentative and provisional, in character. Our affections are just as truly responses to things as are knowing and thinking, and therefore just as truly rooted in reality. But they need direction, and it is only when enlightened by the understanding that they become organs through which we enter into the meaning of the natural world. Thus, once more, knowledge and value stand bound together in practice.

The religious attitude is spoken of as a sense of the possibilities of existence, and as devotion to the cause of these possibilities. It must renounce fixed beliefs in values save the one value of the worth of discovering the possibilities of the actual and striving to realize them. Religion will then become an idealism of action devoted to the creation of a future instead of the maintenance of propositions about the past. The sense of dependence that is characteristic of religion will then be due to the recognition that the intent and effort of man are never final, but are subject to the uncertainties of an indeterminate future.

Hence both philosophy and religion must abandon the quest for the absolute and the immutable both in reality and in value. Thereby they will achieve a richer vitality through the formation of directive hypotheses. To many, all this will seem like philosophical Sansculottism. On the other hand, it is a robust faith, inculcating a spirit of courageous venture. To be able to "greet the unseen with a cheer" is the condition of real achievement in those social and economic sciences which have hitherto proved so stagnant and unprogressive. It is not easy, however, to discover what part is played by God in this great enterprise, and on the whole the religious believer will be left disappointed with a position which fails to relate values to the Divine nature and purpose.

We have noted misprints on pp. 23, 105, 117, 198, 225, 243, 245, 262, 294, 297—far too many in a book of such importance. E. J. Price.

Identity and Reality. By Emile Meyerson. Allen & Unwin. 16s.

One of the outstanding tendencies of the present century is the gradual unification of its main intellectual principles, in striking contrast to the limitations and divisions that inevitably attended the rapid advance of pure science since 1850. Current scientific theories have become so far-reaching, so intricate, and, indeed, to some degree, so self-contradictory as to necessitate the enquiry into the ultimate basis of their validity. In the end, undeniably, all these discrepancies will prove to be only superficial; but their solution carries us beyond the realm of science as such into the wider sphere of philosophy. If we select, as one clear instance of this alliance between science and philosophy, Whitehead's *Process and Reality,* we must also cite Tennant's *Philosophical Theology* as evidence of a similar *rapprochement* between philosophy and theology. We may therefore justifiably anticipate a steady "unification of intellectual principles", parallel in its ideals and general outline to the culminating period of medieval scholasticism, but far richer in its content and profounder in its conclusions. The clashing antagonisms are familiar: between mechanism and freedom, causation and purpose, instinct and reason, a blind automatism and personal autonomy.

M. Meyerson's volume is concerned with the problems arising from the

physico-chemical aspects of modern science. The French original has enjoyed a reputation for over twenty years, and the work well deserves its inclusion in the Library of Philosophy. The author has judged it advisable to deal with the Quantum Theory and the Theory of Relativity only in supplementary notes; but apart from these most recent developments, he has surveyed the entire course of the physical sciences from their origin in ancient Greek speculation. He employs the historic growth of scientific theory to illuminate our ordinary knowledge of the natural world, utilizing for his purpose an almost unrivalled acquaintance with the details of earlier research and hypothesis. The human mind, he maintains, is so constituted that it must always seek to explain the infinite diversity of Nature in terms of unvarying law, and its apparent contingency by a rigid causation. Thus there is an inherent and ineradicable tendency of man's intellect, from which have arisen all the varied theories of molecular and atomic structure, of mechanism and of conservation. In other words, intellectual activity is directed throughout by its craving for a simplified, but at the same moment universal, scheme wherein to fit the multitudinous detail of natural processes.

All this raises issues of crucial importance. How, *e.g.*, is this purely intellectual ideal to be reconciled with the equally imperative demands of the human spirit for freedom, beauty, and purpose as actual factors in the universe? Many scientific workers would urge, with Eddington, that science can yield nothing more than its own world of symbolism, while reality in itself can be revealed only through some form of mystical experience. With these ultimate questions, however, the present volume is concerned only indirectly; and yet it would appear to justify the conclusions just indicated. For M. Meyerson argues that though the demands of the pure intellect are most fully satisfied by the principles of mechanism, still this involves the fatal paradox that the more thoroughly mechanism itself is applied, the more self-contradictory and even absurd it must become. Ultimately, then, the intellect is condemned to stultify itself, since its own reasoning brings us face to face, in the end, with the irrational. As I have already observed, our sole avenue of escape from this dilemma seems to lie in an appeal to mysticism as man's response to that aspect of the real universe, or to the element in the divine nature which Otto has emphasized as the "numinous". But there still remains the further alternative of expanding the idea of mechanism, as current physics is plainly engaged in doing in the new theories of the atom and electron, while at the same time relating all mechanism to personality as it logically demands to be. And although this latter suggestion lies outside the scope of M. Meyerson's book, there is no doubt that it deserves the attention of all readers interested in the philosophy of modern science as illustrated by the history of chemistry and physics. J. E. Turner.

Ethical Principles. By Hans Driesch. Allen & Unwin. 7s. 6d.

It is said that Hegel completed his *magnum opus* undisturbed by the guns battering the walls of Jena. To-day the philosopher is disturbed by the shouting of the newsboy under his window; he is compelled to bring his theory to bear on the problems that form the headlines of our daily papers. The "ought to be" must be related to the "is". The value of this volume is that it does face up to the practical ethical problems, whether they fall within politics, marriage relations, or education. The theoretical basis of the volume, as might be expected from a Gifford Lecturer, is metaphysical, and a section dealing with Prolegomena gives us a theory which

has elements of Kantian formalism, an idealistic "super-personal end", and Intuitionism. The ultimate ethical intuition—"it ought to be"—is general and would apply to the super-personal end if we could formulate it. But Driesch goes further than this—and it is here that many will disagree with him—and argues that we have intuitions of the *good* in specific situations. His doctrine implies that ethical meaning is ultimately affective and not logical. This is along the line of much experimental psychology. What we can "intuit", however, is dependent largely upon Enlightenment: his last section deals with this and his final word is that Enlightenment has religion for its aim.

It is his second section that will attract the teacher and statesman, and to them his volume is directed. This section deals with the Doctrine of Duties applied to ourselves, our neighbours, the State, education, *etc.* Great emphasis is laid upon the dignity of the soul, not because it is the bearer of the moral law, as Kant argued, but because on it depends the intuition of ethical direction, both general and particular. There is a strenuous polemic against war, although it seems to me that he leans more heavily here upon reflective consideration than upon his ethical intuition.

The most difficult part of the book to accept is his doctrine of "apology". He uses it in his discussion on property, birth-control, and unearned interest. The doctrine seems to leave a great deal of territory to the casuist. After all, the function of ethics is to justify imperatives, as Laird puts it, and not to excuse conduct. On birth-control he argues that the exercise of the instinct of sex without a propagation aim "ought not to be"; but it *may* be if because, if it were not, higher interests would be harmed. This, it seems to me, must be the position of those who give to sex simply a biological function as Driesch does; if sex, however, has a psychological and sociological function a very different type of justification can be made. In his treatment of the State and its internal relations we see how far modern thought has travelled from the doctrine of the Sovereign State. One wishes that space could be allowed for quotations from all parts of the book, but especially from his directions to those who educate our children. It is a book to be read and read again; and if occasionally we get irritated by his fondness for saying "in my opinion" when we expect a reasoned justification, we shall find compensation from his resolute facing of problems which the ethical philosopher has too often forgotten.

JOHN G. MCKENZIE.

SHORTER NOTICES AND DESCRIPTIVE LIST.

*(Books marked * are recommended for ministerial reading.)*

Ministers looking for a cheap, handy book on apocalypse could not do better than get the Rev. W. J. Ferrar's * *From Daniel to St. John the Divine* (S.P.C.K., 3/6), four lectures delivered at Cambridge. The titles of the lectures are "The *Book of Daniel*"; "From *Daniel* to the Christian Era"; "Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic, 1—100 A.D."; "The Christian Apocalypse and After."

Our readers are well aware that in the Rev. A. D. Martin the Congregational ministry possesses one of its most acute, cultured, and spiritually sensitive minds. While abreast of modern scholarship, Mr. Martin never loses sight of the main purpose of preaching—to bring the good news that is in Christ Jesus to the hearts of the hearers. *Foreshewings of Christ* (S.P.C.K., 5s.), his new book, reveals again the

fine spirit we remarked in *Aspects of the Way,* now turned to the exposition of some of the leading figures of the *O.T.,* but including with Jeremiah and Job less important names like Balaam and Jeroboam, making ten chapters in all before we reach "The Great Fulfilment." The quotations prefixed to the chapters are themselves revealing, for they show not only the range of Mr. Martin's reading but also his unerring taste.

The new volume in the "Anglican Library of Faith and Thought" (Longmans, 4s. and 2s. 6d.), is Prof. N. P. Williams's *The Grace of God,* a scholarly little book which treats the subject historically.

God and Man (Blackwell, 6s.), is the third volume of selections from Dr. Hastings Rashdall's sermons and addresses. The editors, Dr. Major and the Rev. F. L. Cross, have had no light task in selecting from a mass of material. They have wisely included in these papers, which all deal with the Incarnation, the relation of man to the Creator, and kindred topics, a number of articles which have appeared in periodicals; equally wisely they have removed references to ephemeral controversies.

From The Carey Press (2s. 6d.) come the first two volumes of a series called "The Missionary Message of the New Testament". They are Dr. Townley Lord's *Acts,* and the Rev. H. Cook's *Romans.* In each case the aim is to bring out for non-technical readers the main message of the books.

Good News from God (Longmans, 3s. 6d.) contains 11 sermons preached by the Bishop of London on his Lenten Mission this year, all but the last (in St. Paul's) in churches in North London. We are interested to see that the Bishop calls himself an "Orthodox Modernist", but we should be glad if he could speak without referring to the fact that he once lived in Bethnal Green ! And we wonder if anyone ever referred to Dr. Dale as "dear old Dr. Dale" when he was alive !

The Rev. T. W. Coleman's **The Free Church Sacrament and Catholic Ideals* (Dent, 2s. 6d) will arouse opposition, but it is a thoughtful little book and deserves careful reading. Mr. Coleman believes that the Free Church Lord's Supper can approximate more closely to the Mass and yet retain unimpaired evangelical faith and experience, and that if the Free Churches would make it so approximate, they would greatly help reunion. Mr. Coleman puts very well the Free Church view of the Sacrament, and he represents a considerable body of Free Church opinion which desires fuller and warmer sacramental teaching. But we scarcely think many will go as far as he desires in changing the form of service and adopting the so-called *Free Church Book of Common Prayer.* And it must be remembered that while, on the one side, many Free Churchmen would give a more central place to Holy Communion, many others have strong sympathy with the Quaker view of the Sacraments. Mr. Coleman puts that view on one side far too casually, as he does also the contention that Jesus Himself never instituted the Sacrament. The book would be ideal for a minister's study circle.

There is a well-known American story about Dr. Parkes Cadman. It is said that after dinner one night a group of Americans were engaged in a competition as to who could tell the best fairy tale. After many attempts one man began : "Once upon a time, somebody asked Dr. Parkes Cadman a question, and he replied 'I don't know' ". The prize was awarded to him right away !

We are glad that English readers have been given a selection from Dr. Cadman's answers in the daily press. In *Answers to Everyday Questions* (Sharp, 12s. 6d.), we have 350 pages of answers, averaging about

a page each, and classified under these heads: "Personal Problems"; "Domestic Relations"; "Religion and the Church"; "Philosophy, Theology, and Science"; "Education and Literature"; "Biblical Difficulties"; "The Future Life"; "Americana"; and "Miscellaneous Subjects". Every answer is helpful and to the point, and Dr. Cadman never shirks difficulties. Commonsense marks them all, while often a touch of humour is thrown in. Thousands have been helped by these answers: we wish someone equally competent could conduct a similar column in the daily press of this country.

The Rev. Percy Austin's *Letters to a Fundamentalist* (S.C.M., 6s.) is quite a good book to put into the hands of people perplexed by Biblical criticism. It is both clear and sane, and should prove a help to many.

The contributors to *Episcopacy, Ancient and Modern* (S.P.C.K., 12s. 6d.), edited by Dr. Claude Jenkins and the Rev. K. D. Mackenzie, have placed all students of the subject in their debt, and not least those among them whose conclusions many will be forced to reject. Foremost among these is Dr. Lowther Clarke, whose sketch of "The Origins of Episcopacy" deserves special attention. Dr. Lowther Clarke will have none of Canon Streeter's "Everyone has won, and all shall have prizes." He says:

> I cannot see any ground for asserting that Presbyterianism or Independency has won. They are both sixteenth-century antiquarian reconstructions of the Apostolic Age without the Apostles. An independent congregation, without supervision from outside, never existed.

Now how in the world did Dr. Lowther Clarke get to know that?

Dr. Jenkins himself has a scholarly account of the Medieval Bishop, which is followed by chapters on Episcopacy in the Anglican Communion in different parts of the world (the Bishop of Southwark on England is very good) and in other Communions, including the Roman and the Orthodox. Dean Bate's examination of the continuity of the ministry in Scottish Presbyterianism and in Methodism makes one of the best chapters in the book, but we should scarcely have called Sir Henry Lunn, who writes on "The Free Churches and Episcopacy," a representative Free Churchman. And he refers to Dr. W. E. Barton "the Great American *Baptist*"! What is fame?

Baron von Hügel's *Some Notes on the Petrine Claims* (Sheed & Ward, 3s. 6d.), raises an interesting question besides that of the Papacy. The Baron wrote these notes to a friend as far back as 1893, in answer to letters from a High Anglican. They are characteristically acute, but, as he admits in the additional *Post Scripta,* rather hurried and scrappy. He did not publish them himself, but soon after his death they see the light, at whose instance it does not appear. Is this justifiable?

In a previous work Dr. G. J. Jordan has shown both his interest in the question of Church unity and his capacity to deal with an involved and difficult subject. Believing that the study of a period of schism and of the way it was resolved will assist the cause of unity, he has now written *The Inner History of the Great Schism of the West* (Williams & Norgate, 7s. 6d.). He traces the story from 1378 to 1417, insisting the while that Christians to-day can gain inspiration from those "who fought with splendid courage to bring unity to a divided Christendom."

Dr. R. L. Langford-James's *The Bridge-Church* (Allan, 2s. 6d.), has a Preface by Mr. Sidney Dark, the authorship of which could have been surmised had no name been attached. Dr. Langford-James, however,

would go farther than Mr. Dark, for he believes that the time has arrived now when the unnatural alliance of the two parties in the Church of England should cease, and the Anglo-Catholics coalesce with the Orthodox Church. The bridge toward the East, he says, is nearly complete, and it would make for sincerity, the formation of a non-Papal Catholicism, and the progress of religion, were the Anglo-Catholics to pass over it.

Another book by an Anglo-Catholic is Dr. W. J. Sparrow-Simpson's *St. Augustine's Conversion* (S.P.C.K., 10s. 6d.), the nature of which is much more accurately indicated in the sub-title—"An Outline of His Development to the time of His Ordination." Many readers will be interested in the work, not merely for its subject, but also as an example of the application of the principles of higher criticism to a non-canonical writing. Thirteen years passed between Augustine's conversion and the writing of the *Confessions,* years full of development, and what Augustine wrote of his life before conversion could not but be coloured by his subsequent experience. To unravel the tangle and weave the threads together in a pattern has been Dr. Sparrow-Simpson's task and evident delight. He has made a real contribution to learning.

Last quarter we reviewed Herr René Fülöp-Miller's *Lenin and Gandhi.* Now we have before us the translation of his massive work on the Society of Jesus, the most difficult task, we think, to which Herr Fülöp-Miller has so far set his hand. To write adequately of *The Power and Secret of the Jesuits* (Putnam, 21s.), demands more than a biographer's skill : it calls for a firm grip of history, an acquaintance—much more than an acquaintance—with philosophy and theology, and, indeed, almost an encyclopædic range of knowledge.

The opening chapters show Herr Fülöp-Miller's power of seizing on the essentials of his subject. He begins with the *Spiritual Exercises,* and shows how Loyola insisted—and showed by example—that men need not wait for the divine presence and illumination ; they should rather secure them by the effort of will and discipline. Thence he proceeds to show how the military obedience of the Order was linked with forms of service which demanded the best of a man's powers. Thus started, Herr Fülöp-Miller's journey takes him all over the world—into the Courts of Kings and the schools of philosophers, as well as to India and far away China. In power and in decline the principles and methods of the Jesuits are studied, and their services to civilization estimated. Through it all the writer shows a keen sense of observation and a judicial temper, and his work will long be a convenient book of reference.

Sir Ian Malcolm's little impression of *Lord Balfour* (Macmillan, 7s. 6d.) shows that even a philosophic statesman can be a hero to his valet. So many people have testified to Balfour's charm that it must be recognized as an objective fact, but in what the charm consisted nothing yet written has enabled those to discover who did not know Balfour personally. There are pleasant stories in this volume, which arises from the fact that Sir Ian was for a time one of Balfour's secretaries, but at the end the subject of the impression still remains "with his colours nailed to the fence".

After reading Sir Ian Malcolm, it is interesting to turn to the sketch of Balfour in Dr. Knut Hagberg's *Personalities and Powers* (Bodley Head, 12s. 6d.), where we read :—

> In the era of democracy a man must fight and push his way to the front; Lord Balfour is the last to lounge to the front.

Perhaps the truth of the matter lies somewhere between the hero-worship of Sir Ian and the cynical depreciation of the Swedish writer.

Other Britishers who appear in this translation of Dr. Hagberg's second book are Melbourne, Disraeli, Gladstone, Harcourt, Parnell, Rhodes, Kitchener, George Wyndham, Lord Grey of Fallodon, and John Stuart Mill—and we suppose Samuel Pickwick must be included. The remaining sketches are of Paul Deschanel, Renan, and Isabella D'Este. Dr. Hagberg has his strong aversions—it is clear he cannot stand John Morley at any price. He is also full of confidence : most critics would, we think, hesitate a long time before saying that Edward Grey was "quite without ideas" when he entered Parliament. But he is extremely readable, and it is profitable to learn how our politicians look to an outsider. There is a misprint on p. 168, and has not *arraignée* an "r" too many on p. 161?

The late Sir Lionel Cust's *King Edward VII and His Court* (Murray, 12s.) is the kind of book that makes republicans by the hundred. Sir Lionel was Surveyor of the King's Pictures and Gentleman Usher, and he was brought into personal touch with Edward VII largely owing to the renovation, *etc.*, of all the royal residences on the King's accession. There is ground for the claim that the book adds something to Sir Sidney Lee's biography, but much of it is "small beer" which will be appreciated only in circles where they talk of "the dear king" who does everything so graciously, or still believe in Charles the Martyr. Others will see Edward revealed as a very fallible human being. We do not think Sir Lionel liked Sir Walter Parratt, the Master of the King's Music, but for a courtier this is very neat : "The music which gave King Edward most pleasure was not that which Sir Walter Parratt liked to provide".

Discourses and Letters of Hubert Murray Burge (Chatto & Windus, 12s. 6d.) is divided into three parts. First we have an admirable Memoir by Lord Charnwood, in which the Bishop's work at Winchester, and in the sees of Southwark and Oxford, is described; then comes a selection of addresses, sermons, and visitation charges, aptly chosen to illustrate Burge's scholarship, interests, and outlook; and finally a collection of letters to his friend, Arthur Kemball Cook, dated from just before Burge left Winchester in 1911 to 1925. It is no disparagement to the other sections to say that the letters are the best part of the book. In graphic sentences Burge describes places and persons, and we get many a glimpse of the political world in troubled times. Of Asquith and Ireland we read in April, 1914 :

> There has been a certain amount of blundering all round, and I fancy the Prime Minister would have been more comfortable without the assistance (?) of some of his colleagues: but of course he is much too loyal a person ever to hint such a thing.

Of Mr. Ramsay MacDonald and the election of 1924 we are told :

> These last few months have been extraordinarily interesting in politics: I was staying with Haldane at Cloan just about the time of the dissolution in the Autumn, and I gathered that Ramsay MacDonald had become quite overwrought, and so far as his colleagues were concerned acted more and more independently of them: he decided upon a dissolution finally quite "on his own", and never even consulted Henderson, who is responsible for the party organisation, as to whether they were prepared.

It is specially interesting, too, to find the Bishop saying, after reading Trevelyan's *John Bright* in 1913 : "Why aren't we all Quakers? Is it because so very few people really can be Christians?"

Sir Alfred Hopkinson's *Penultima* (Hopkinson, 18s.) is such pleasant reading that we hope it is not his "Swan Song". Now nearly eighty years of age, he has played his part in politics, law, and education, and his long life and wide knowledge enable him to make comparisons and

test progress in a way possible to few. His three lists of "New and Good Things", "New and Bad Things", and "Bad Things which have disappeared" are in themselves sufficient to suggest both the serene good humour and the sane commonsense with which Sir Alfred regards life. While some will turn with special interest to what he has to say about the new Universities, or about the changes he has seen in law, politics, and society, we are naturally most interested in his attitude to religion. He admits time and again the debt he owes to the surroundings in which he was brought up, those of Evangelical Nonconformity, his parents worshipping at an Independent Chapel in Manchester. A picture like that which he gives of his home should be placed side by side with Edmund Gosse's *Father and Son* in order that the whole truth might be seen.

The volume contains many sidelights on the political and religious figures of the last generation. Sir Alfred left the Liberal Party on Home Rule, but he has never been a mere Party man. He has, however, been the type of man of which Congregationalism may be proud: we hope that we are growing his like to-day! Is it not, by the way, rather an exaggeration to say that "Dr. Parker forced Gladstone to break with Parnell"?

Mr. Hamilton Fyfe's *Northcliffe: An Intimate Biography* (Allen & Unwin, 16s.) is extremely readable. Whether it is equally reliable is a matter on which there seem to be two opinions. Both in letterpress and in the choice of illustration it is certainly more frank than modest! We have reason to be grateful to Mr. Fyfe, nevertheless, for the way in which he has gathered and arranged his material. Northcliffe touched life at many points, as a newspaper man must, but the wood is never lost in the trees. From youth to power and decline—though we might have been spared the details of Northcliffe's illness—we see the forceful personality at work—"the greatest transforming force that has appeared in British journalism", Robertson Nicoll called him.

Many readers will turn with special interest to the pages dealing with the part Northcliffe played in politics during the war. A full account is given of his work as Director of Propaganda in Enemy Lands. He was well called "A master of mass suggestion": we see him pouring into Germany millions of documents suggesting that the German people would not be held responsible for the misdeeds of the German Government, and then, once the collapse of German *morale* has been secured, forgetting, personally and in his papers, all about these promises, and determined to "make Germany pay".

As an example of the brief, workmanlike memoir, Mrs. Adami's *J. George Adami* (Constable, 10s. 6d.), deserves every commendation. It is the right length, and it is difficult to see how the space could have been put to better use. Adami's life was divided into four parts: preparation at Cambridge; the long period as Prof. of Pathology at Montreal; four years with the Canadian Army Medical Service; and finally, Vice-Chancellor of Liverpool University. To an adequate account of the activity of Adami in all these spheres, Mrs. Adami adds an Introduction by Sir Humphry Rolleston, and chapters by those who shared special branches of her husband's work.

Mrs. W. L. Courtney's *The Making of an Editor* (Macmillan, 6s.) is an account of her husband's life and work, and especially of his connexion with the *Fortnightly*. It contains a good deal of information about the periodical literature of Courtney's lifetime, and lets us see the development of the Press during forty important years. It is by no means a formal biography: not even read with *The Passing Hour* do we get the full flavour of Courtney's personality.

Herr Karl Tschuppik's *The Empress Elizabeth of Austria* (Constable, 12s.) can almost be described as " the novel from the film". It is cinematographic in its high lights, and in its rapid jumps from one event to another. Marriages, murders, suicides, we have in plenty, while the long intervals of routine life are skipped. Of course, it must be admitted that there was so much of tragedy in the life of Elizabeth and her family—her brothers and sisters as well as her children—that it is scarcely possible in a brief life to avoid giving this effect. Reading of Franz Joseph we were once more frequently reminded of Philip II of Spain, but even more often the story carried us back to the days of Greek tragedy. What an opportunity, what a challenge, it presents to the dramatist! Where is the modern Sophocles or the modern Shakespeare to use it?

The volume is most admirably translated by Mr. Eric Sutton.

Among the pleasantest books of the quarter we place the translation of M. Régis Michaud's *Emerson, The Enraptured Yankee* (Cape, 15s.). M. Michaud has made a long and close study of everything connected with Emerson; he has a style that marches, and the result is a vivid presentation of the Concord sage and his writings. M. Michaud is a discriminating critic, as witness the delightful comparison of Carlyle and Emerson on p. 307, or the following: " Carlyle was a thunder-bolt, Wordsworth an Æolian harp, Coleridge a Babel". We can promise the student of literature or the lover of a good style a couple of happy evenings with this animated French writer.

Last year, in reviewing Stefan Zweig's *Adepts in Self-Portraiture,* the translation of Vol. III of his *Master Builders: An Attempt at the Typology of the Spirit,* we spoke of the writer's profound insight, great skill, and tiresome reiteration. The same characteristics mark Vol. I, now translated under the title of *Three Masters* (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.). The three are Balzac, Dickens, and Dostoeffsky. The first two sketches are but slight, but on Dostoeffsky, whom he greatly admires, putting him second only to Shakespeare, Herr Zweig lets himself go.

We had precisely the same experience in reading each essay. First we were repelled by the turgid eloquence Herr Zweig invariably employs: then we were made to pause by the amazing aptness of his criticism and the cleverness of some of his phrases. This will be very patent to all lovers of Dickens, while the sketch of Dostoeffsky is in many ways masterly. Take, for example, the reminder that in Dostoeffsky we have no fresh air, nor the slightest indication of, say, the season of the year: or of how seldom in thousands of pages Dostoeffsky "tells us that his characters sit down, or that they eat and drink: always they are in the act of feeling, or speaking, or fighting". Or think of Dostoeffsky's novels as "miracles of emotional condensation"—Dostoeffsky gets all the happenings of the first three hundred pages of *The Idiot* into twelve hours.

No student of literature and literary criticism should miss these volumes.

Some years ago we reviewed Dr. Fritz Wittels's *Sigmund Freud,* in which he described the life, personality, and teaching of the pioneer of psycho-analysis, as we suppose he might be called. Moved by the misunderstanding of Freud in America, Dr. Wittels has now written *Critique of Love* (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.) in order "to prove to the American people that the new truth in connexion with the sexual life which Freud has brought to us in his illuminating work is not as loathsome as many people imagine". Many people, we imagine, would admire Dr. Wittels's lucid style who deplore his master's obsession with sex. We cannot but feel here, as often with so many of the new psychologists, that the

abnormal is treated as the normal, and one aspect of personality stressed to the exclusion of everything else. How does Dr. Wittels know, for example, that John Wilkes Booth would not have murdered Lincoln had he been psycho-analysed, or that a "homosexual component is not to be overlooked in Joan of Arc"?

We have the usual chapters on sadism, masochism, bisexuality, narcissism, the Oedipus complex, and dreams. Everywhere the emphasis is on one thing:

> A church or any other sacred room in which we dwell in dreams always means the mother, according to one of the best fortified statements of psycho-analytical dream interpretation.

The view of Christianity is again, as usual with so many modern scientists, strangely antiquated: a version is given of it on page 81 which includes original sin and hell fires.

We are far from minimizing the place of sex in human life, but to make the part into the whole is absolutely unscientific and altogether misleading.

Any doubter, we think, would be convinced of this by reading the latest English work of Dr. Freud himself, *Civilization and Its Discontents* (Hogarth Press, 8s. 6d.), a rather expensive essay in the "International Psycho-Analytical Library". It is, of course, difficult to argue with a person who takes up the position of Dr. Freud, for he is

> sure only of one thing, that the judgments of value made by mankind are immediately determined by their desires for happiness: in other words that those judgments are attempts to prop up their illusions with arguments.

While he, himself, does not know the "oceanic" feeling experienced by some of his friends (by this he means the feeling of mystery, of eternity, of the numinous) he acknowledges it exists, but he is "disposed to relate it to an early stage in ego-feeling". Religion, indeed, is derived "from the child's feeling of helplessness and the longing it evokes for a father": the religions of humanity are "mass-delusions", and, "by the forcible imposition of mental infantilism and inducing a mass-delusion religion succeeds in saving many people from individual neuroses".

The phenomena of guilt and conscience are then considered: it takes Dr. Freud a great many words to say

> They who fain would serve Thee best
> Are conscious most of wrong within.

Guilt and conscience are explained as the result of a primal antagonism between Eros and Death, a heightening of the sense of guilt appearing in place of an unfulfilled erotic desire. Again, it may be interesting, but can it be called science?

Dr. E. S. Waterhouse's *Psychology and Religion* (Mathews & Marrot, 5s.) consists of a series of broadcast talks. There is a real place for this book, which ministers can confidently recommend to young people and others. It tackles vital problems in an interesting way and with abundant illustration, and should be very helpful.

So many books on astronomy begin by assuming a good deal of knowledge in their readers that it is a pleasure to get one that begins at the beginning. Dr. Oswald Thomas's *The Heavens and the Universe* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) is translated by Mr. Bernard Miall from the German. It contains talks given by Dr. Thomas to listeners invited to attend by advertisements in the Press—on one occasion no less than 1,200 people arrived. And, reading the book, we are not surprised that so many were inclined to spend their nights in this fashion.

Mr. Ralph de Pomerai tells us that his *Marriage: Past, Present and Future* (Constable, 15s.), had a long history before assuming its present form. He calls it "An Outline of the History and Development of Human Sex Relationships," and we cannot but think it would have been better to re-cast its chapters or, perhaps better still, make it into two books. As it is, we have first a series of chapters on the history of marriage, covering Westermarck's ground, but sometimes controverting Westermarck's theories. Then come chapters on divorce, in which Mr. de Pomerai, like so many, seems more interested than he does in marriage; here we have a careful analysis of the teaching of Jesus. An examination of the complexity of modern matrimony follows, with suggestions for the reform of the divorce laws: "conjugal default on the part of either of the parties for the period of one year, should constitute the legitimate ground for granting divorce," certificates being granted by registrars of marriages, and nobody being allowed more than three! The probable development of marriage in the future is then outlined, and Mr. Ludovici violently denounced. The book is thus a mixture of science and propaganda, the restraint of the first part being in striking contrast to the vigour of the second, where "imbecility" is a favourite expression—"Puritanical" is another—and there are many extravagant statements. The book contains much that is useful: it is a pity that it is disfigured by such obvious blemishes.

In *The Living and the Lifeless* (Harrap, 3s. 6d.), Dr. Beatrice Hinkle has translated the "marginalia" of Mr. Dirk Coster, the Dutch writer. The volume consists of a collection of apophthegms, of varying degrees of insight, but believed by Dr. Hinkle to contain profound wisdom and to be worthy of comparison with Nietzsche's sayings.

The Rev. J. O. Dobson's *Why Christian Missions?* (S.C.M., 1s.), answers its question in the light of the world situation to-day.

The Bantu are Coming (S.C.M., 5s.), consists of vivid and vigorous, sometimes almost passionate, sketches of life among the Bantu, by the Rev. R. E. Phillips. His pictures show various aspects of the race problem, and make the reader realize the black man's awakening to his exploitation by the white. We see, too, the results of industrialization, and the way the Communist seizes the opportunity for propaganda, and inflames the masses against the employer, the white man, and the missionary—and the tremendous challenge of all this to the Christian Church.

Deserving of most careful reading is Dr. Nicol Macnicol's **India in the Dark Wood* (Livingstone Press, 2s. 6d.), and it is exceptionally welcome just now when

> nationalism has entered into possession of the educated mind of India and has taken the place of religion, if, indeed, we should not rather say that it has itself become a religion.

Dr. Macnicol first shows us sections of Non-Christian India: "The Educated—Groping", "The Illiterate Masses—Stirring in Their Sleep", "The Women—Aroused". Two chapters then deal with the Christian Church in India to-day: "Educated and Articulate", "Inarticulate and in Bondage". Finally comes a chapter on "The Foreign Mission". Based on long experience, the book has peculiar authority and no thoughtful Christian ought to miss it.

Mr. Stephen Neill's *Out of Bondage* (Livingstone Press, 2s.) tells of the challenge of the Indian village to Christianity. While "the life of India is in its villages", one-sixth of the whole missionary force in India

is concentrated in ten large towns, and "many missionaries and nearly all educated Indian Christians are town-minded".

Mr. Neill gives what looks like an authentic picture of village life, and he shows how the motor-bus is transforming it in India as here. We are glad to note that he thinks Miss Christlieb's *An Uphill Road in India* "on the whole the best book about India I have read".

Mrs. Payne's *The Very Heart of China* (Carey Press, 2s. 6d.) contains living pictures of missionary work in China written by one whose warm-hearted sympathy suffuses every page of the book.

Mr. F. C. Glass's *Through Brazilian Junglelands with the Book* (Pickering, 3s. 6d.) is an account of the adventurous work of a colporteur of the British and Foreign Bible Society. We can admire the spirit and the courage of a worker of this type, but we cannot but regret the narrowness of the gospel he presents. He is bitterly opposed to Rome and to "Beelzebub and his friends the Modernists", while he finds it necessary to speak to converts, not only about Sabbath observance, drink, and the use of tobacco, but also about the "modern fasions of the women, not omitting to remark on the perils that await the shorn female".

It was a happy thought of somebody to gather together a selection of Dame Henrietta Barnett's papers and addresses. *Matters that Matter* (Murray, 7s. 6d.) is at one and the same time a useful storehouse for social workers and a picture of a long and attractive life devoted entirely to the service of mankind. To tremendous enthusiasm and a passionate love for the poor, and for beauty, Dame Barnett has added sound commonsense and an apt humour that oft-times comes with irresistible force in the addresses. As an old lady, placed in a flat by Mrs. Barnett, said to the Queen: "I like it all . . . except the windows, but there, dear Mrs. Barnett is such a draughty lady". Mrs. Barnett has certainly let fresh air into many fusty places, and no woman of our time is more worthy of the esteem in which she is held. This book, containing addresses and articles from the last twenty years, is a feast of good things.

Dr. Gilbert Slater is to be congratulated on his *Poverty and the State* (Constable, 12s. 6d.) which social workers are sure to find a mine of information for many a year. The title hardly suggests the scope of the book, which not only deals with questions like the Poor Law, Housing, the Aged, and Unemployment, but also with the Care of the Child, Alcohol, Betting, *etc.* Some may consider that too much is packed into the book, and that its arrangement might have been improved. But it certainly deserves the consideration—as it will certainly have the constant use, once it has been read—of all interested in the well-being of the English people. Dr. Slater has something to say on "Empire Free Trade", and he believes in "the revivification of agriculture as the most helpful resource for restoring economic and social well-being". We wondered what a "rag-day" was, and thought possibly the hospitals had discovered some wonderful new method of raising funds, but we suspect it is only a compositor's version of a "flag-day". Possibly, however, "rag-day" is correct.

With an unemployed total of 2,000,000, and all the hardship and suffering it implies, Christians cannot but feel bound to use every effort to discover the solution of the industrial problem. *The Just Price* (S.C.M., 4s. 6d.), one of the first results of the research work of the Christian Social Council, is "An Outline of the Medieval Doctrine, and an Examination of its Possible Equivalent To-day." Edited by the Rev. V. A. Demant, it contains essays by writers of various Communions, including

the Roman Catholic, the Anglican, and the Congregationalist (the Rev. M. Spencer). It is encouraging to find such a group working together, and the temper of the book leaves nothing to be desired, though it is not very plain what practical suggestions are made for applying the medieval doctrine to the modern situation.

We must confess that we have been disappointed in Prof. Charles Gide's *Communist and Co-operative Colonies* (Harrap, 7s. 6d.), now translated by Mr. E. F. Row. Although it contains a good deal of information, it is far from providing the handbook for which there is a real place. Nor does Prof. Gide inspire our confidence: his failure to understand Protestantism and Quakerism, his belief that "in England the Sunday has merely replaced the Jewish Sabbath," his description of the author of *The Scarlet Letter* as "a writer named Hawthorne, who is remembered with gratitude by men of my generation for delighting them with his mythological stories for children," excite wonder and suspicion rather than trust.

But Prof. Gide has had a wide field to survey, and he can scarcely be expected to speak with authority about every part of it—about monastic communities, about Jesuits and Shakers, agrarian groups and Zionist zealots, and many more. And he is surely wise in pointing to the significant fact that the communist societies which have lasted have been composed, in the main, of members of religious sects.

From this study of Communist experiments through the ages we turn to a particular period—the veteran Eduard Bernstein's *Cromwell and Communism* (Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.), now translated by Mr. H. J. Stenning, which, as one of the volumes in Karl Kautsky's *History of Socialism,* has gone to four German editions.

Herr Bernstein accepts Thorold Rogers's view that the agricultural labourer was better off under the Puritan than under the Cavalier, but we think he is something less than fair in proclaiming that " Cromwell was devoted body and soul to the cause of the propertied classes ". On the whole, however, the book is a very useful and competent sketch of the subject during the Commonwealth. Herr Bernstein does not make the mistake of reading twentieth century ideas back into the seventeenth century: he sees that " the peasantry was so preponderant that even Democracy could not advance beyond an agrarian programme suitable for small peasant proprietors", and also that it was not until the Chartists that the work of the " Levellers " was resumed. Of Lilburne, Winstanley, Harrington (who is said to have " exercised a far greater influence on the revolutionary literature of the eighteenth century than is generally known"), and that remarkable Quaker, John Bellers, we have careful studies. We note, however, the same failure to understand Puritanism that we saw in Herr Dibelius. Are "puritanical sanctimoniousness and political Radicalism peculiar to the Anglo-Saxon world "? And how can anyone who lived through the War think that " Quakerism to-day vegetates simply as a survival from former days "?

The Young People's Department of the Congregational Union has very wisely combined with the Temperance Committee in preparation for the Young People's Examination this year. Two very useful text books have been prepared: the senior book, *Fit for Life* (Independent Press, 1s.), by the Rev. R. W. Thompson, and the junior, *Fit for Anything* (Independent Press, 6d.), by Mr. Charles Harvey and Mr. Thompson.

No people in the world are more intensely patriotic than the Tyrolese,

and it is easy to imagine how the people of South Tyrol felt when the Treaty of Versailles, in one of the most iniquitous of its many follies, handed their beloved land over to Italy. In it were 220,000 German-Austrians, as against 7,000 Italians, but to Italy the province was given, in spite of all prayers and protests. From that time, and especially since the rise of Mussolini, a ruthless attempt to Italianize the province has been made. The use of the German language has been forbidden, even in the schools, and it has been made an offence to teach children German at home. Tyrolese institutions have been destroyed, and the *Carabinieri* allowed to illtreat the people at will. A people wholly literate has been put into the power of a nation which in 1911 had 43 per cent. illiterates, and all they count dear has been torn from them. The story is told with passion but with restraint in *Tyrol under the Axe of Italian Fascism* (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.) by Dr. Eduard Reut-Nicolussi, one of the Tyrolese leaders now in exile. When the tyranny of Mussolini cracks—as crack it must—its weakness will first be made manifest, we think, in freedom-loving Tyrol. This applies even though there has been some alleviation of the oppressive measures since Dr. Nicolussi wrote.

Signor Ettore Janni, a well-known Italian journalist, published his *Machiavelli* in 1927 : it is now (Harrap, 12s. 6d.) translated into English, with a new Preface for English readers. The book is a chatty account of Machiavelli's life and friendships, and an exposition of his writings. As we read, we are made very conscious that Signor Janni has an ulterior motive in writing, as, indeed, he himself confesses :

> This book has been written to vindicate the teaching of Machiavelli from its misappropriation by the upholders of terror—whatever the colour of their uniforms.

Most readers, we imagine, will peruse the book, not for new light on Machiavelli, but to see how Signor Janni applies Machiavelli to Mussolini. Not so can history be studied ; not so should it be written !

Mrs. Gardiner's *The Story of Lambeth Palace* (Constable, 15s.) was written at the request of Archbishop Lord Davidson, for so many years resident in the Palace. It tells the story from the beginnings in the troubled days at the end of the 12th century down to Archbishop Davidson's retirement. Mrs. Gardiner describes some of the many varied scenes of which Lambeth has been the venue during the seven centuries of its life, and increases the value of her survey by printing a list of the consecrations in the Palace Chapel.

The Bishop of Chichester's *Documents on Christian Unity* (Oxford Press, 6s.) deals with the period since 1924, and can be obtained bound with the volume for the years 1920—1924 (12s. 6d.). The new volume is specially valuable at present in that it contains many papers regarding the South Indian Scheme of Union.

Prof. Charles Richet's *The Story of Civilization through the Ages* (Allen & Unwin, 3s. 6d.), now translated by Mr. F. Rothwell, is written especially for children. In 100 pp. the long story is summarized, the point of view being that "science is the great emancipator," but that, if science is to hold sway, there must be peace.

Two volumes in "The World of Youth" series (Watts, 1s. 6d.), are Mr. F. J. Gould's *Great Sons of Greece,* and Mr. R. McMillan's *The Origin of the World* (sixth impression). Mr. Gould's name carried us back to the days when we used his books to help us to teach "citizenship" to girls and boys of ten ! These adaptations of Plutarch are in a vein then made very familiar to us.

Mr. H. L. Hemmens's *Footprints in the Snow* (S.C.M., 3s. 6d.) is, we think, the first venture of the Student Movement into the hazardous territory of the children's address. As we might expect, many of Mr. Hemmens's stories tell of the early lives of missionary heroes. The first twelve addresses are of a more varied kind.

The three new volumes in "The County Anthologies" (Mathews & Marrot, 3s. 6d. each), are *Cumberland* (Walter and Claire Jerrold), *Lancashire* (R. H. Case), and *Middlesex* (T. M. Pope). Cumberland was perhaps the easiest of these counties to manipulate, Lancashire, with Furness (which people often forget is part of Lancashire), having an unexpected element in some of Wordsworth's poems, and Middlesex being a hotch-potch without definite characteristics, though, of course, Pope and Horace Walpole spring to the mind at once. We are glad to find that room has been made for some Lancashire dialect poems, and that Edwin Waugh has not been overlooked.

Mr. W. J. Turner might surely have secured his end in more effective fashion than by writing the smart doggerel which makes up *Miss America* (Mandrake Press, 6s.). So far as one reader, at any rate, is concerned, propaganda of this kind entirely misses the target.

Mr. E. E. Kellett, expert in many literary fields, is now to be congratulated on his success in a new *genre*. He calls *The Conflict* (Constable, 12s.) " A Saga of the Seventh Century", and he contrives to catch both the atmosphere and romance of his period. Perhaps Mr. Kellett was unwise in including the last chapter, an " Epilogue " which seems an anti-climax, but no doubt he felt that readers unacquainted with the period would like to know the fate of his leading characters.

In *The Splendour of the Dawn* (Longmans, 5s.) Mr. John Oxenham continues in the vein of *The Hidden Years, The Cedar Box,* and *God's Candle,* here dealing with the difficult period between the Resurrection of Jesus and the Conversion of Saul. It is not without significance that a novelist of Mr. Oxenham's reputation should think it worth while to write books of this kind. The skill with which he handles the sacred story is as marked as his reverence.

Another "first century novel" is *A Certain Jesus* (Gollancz, 10s. 6d.), the work of Mr. Iwan Naschiwin, whom the publishers call "perhaps the greatest of living Russian writers". Naschiwin is a disciple of Tolstoy, and at present a refugee. Only one of his writings, the historical novel, *Rasputin,* has been translated into English, but the present book is first issued in our language. It is the fruit of a quarter of a century's study, and Naschiwin shows such a profound and detailed understanding of Jewish life and religion that even theologians could learn from the background of his story. From the beginning to the end, however, the life of Jesus is rationalized. Naschiwin believes that the necessary virtue is *Kindness,* and the Jesus whom we see is essentially a kindly soul. The account of the miracle at Cana may be taken as typical. The wine has run out and Jesus sees how humiliated the hosts will be: He therefore gives money to the servants to buy wine, and orders them to fill the water-pots with it.

No part of the Gospel narrative is omitted, and it is a tribute to the writer's genius that, familiar as it is, it still grips the reader from the beginning to the end. But the Jesus who can be accounted for on these lines would never have won the devotion of countless millions during nineteen centuries.

EDITOR.

Now and then one is fortunate to meet with something in the literary line—a poem, or a sermon, or an essay, or a novel, or a biography—which the corresponding mental need at once pronounces satisfying. Principal George Galloway's *Religion and the Transcendent* (University of London Press, 4s. 6d.) is only a little volume—*magnum in parvo*—but in it one reader at least has met with a satisfying answer to some ultimate questions of religious experience which, so long as no clear answer has been reached, are a trouble to the soul's peace. Many big books on the Philosophy of Religion have essayed an answer with more or less success, but in these three Lectures the answer surely is as complete as it can be. For, as Principal Galloway insists, absolute completeness, in the nature of the case, is unattainable. There is a limit to the rational process, and a final summons to faith, but the summons must be to a faith which the rational process has made entirely reasonable. The titles of the Lectures will indicate their scope; "The Transcendent in Religious Experience," "The World-Order and the Transcendent," "Philosophy and the Transcendent." Only a religious man who is also a competent thinker and thoroughly at home in the spheres of science and philosophy could have written them; and they are commended by a style of lucid terseness.

Professor Nairne, in his Foreword, justly describes Mr. G. P. H. Pawson's *The Cambridge Platonists and Their Place in Religious Thought* (S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d.), as an uncommonly modest book—not a handbook to the study of the Cambridge Platonists, but a companion for fellow-disciples in their school. Such fellow disciples are few in number, and have never been numerous; but they exist here and there, and when they read Mr. Pawson they will recognize at once that he is one of the elect, and will confess that he knows of what he is writing, that he has made it his own, that he has found it good to live by, and that he has something fresh of his own to impart which bears witness to his sympathetic insight. But—if a word of criticism may be ventured—one wonders why he has given less space to John Smith, the richest thinker and most eloquent preacher of the group, than to Whichcote, and more space to Henry More, its most fantastic member, than to Smith or Whichcote, and no space at all to Peter Sterry, the one among them who most deserves the name of mystic? One wonders, too, how he has failed to see that Nathaniel Culverwel, so far from concentrating " in himself all the best of what " Whichcote and Smith had to give, fell away from it, at least in his sermons.

The Rev. Bernard Clements's *Philip Cometh to Andrew* (Longmans, 3s. 6d.) is a small volume of sermons and notes on Prayer, *etc.*, by an Anglo-Catholic missionary and saint. It is a book that grips the heart, and closes the lips as to the things, perhaps the many things, which may seem open to question. Here is a taste of its quality :—

> The title I have given the book will explain itself if you will read the text I have printed after it. To me the whole world with various voices seems at the moment to cry out to me as the Greeks did to Philip: " Sir, we would see Jesus." And so often we don't shew Him to them. We shew them, instead, our rather disagreeable selves, and all our likes and dislikes, and our quarrels, petty and great. Many things we shew them, but so often not Jesus. And they turn rather wistfully away. Sometimes they turn impatiently and contemptuously away; and they judge of Jesus by what they see of *us*, whereas they would have judged differently if we had shewed Him to them in very truth, as we could have done.
>
> So, just as Philip came to Andrew, I come to you, so that together we may tell Jesus and see what He would have us do about it.

The Faith "offered to the young men and women of England" by the Rev. Ernest Evans in *A Reason for the Faith* (Murray, 5s.) is that contained in the three creeds, the Apostles', the Nicene, the Athanasian—with particular reference, however, to the Nicene, of which he gives an exposition and defence clause by clause: nor, on the assumption that this creed of the 4th century is valid for all time, could one desire a more reasonable treatment of it, or a treatment more pervaded by a really Christian spirit. It aims to commend the Catholic faith by explaining "old things in a new way," especially to "the acute and well-trained and reverent" young folk of to-day; and there are some of these, no doubt, with whom it will succeed. Moreover, what is said under the head of Christian character will commend itself to all readers, as will also the statement—very welcome from an Anglo-Catholic—"that truly Christian worship, whatever forms it uses, is one and the same."

Dr. G. S. Marr's *A Faith for To-day* (Allenson, 2s. 6d.) is written from a widely different standpoint. It is the attempt of a devout modernist scholar to set forth briefly and simply what, in the light of modern knowledge, the Church should teach about the Bible and God and Sin and Jesus (with reference to the virgin birth) and Atonement and the Resurrection and the Life to Come. Its criticisms of the old orthodoxy are forceful, but they seem so familiar that one is tempted to ask if there is still need for them. Wasn't the fight for a rational faith fought and won in the Campbell controversy 20 years ago? Alas! the answer to that question is a melancholy negative. There are still hundreds of our congregations to whom the views so honestly expressed in this little treatise would sound startlingly strange—which is the strongest possible argument for making them known. Dr. Marr, who is a minister of the Church of Scotland, feels that, as regards his own Church, this is its most urgent need.

> The union of the two great Churches in Scotland has now been carried through . . . [but] of what real benefit will it be to the Church if, after closing churches here and there, the great majority of the remaining buildings are still more or less empty? There is a paramount need for the United Church to attempt the task—admittedly difficult and delicate—of re-interpreting the Christian faith in the light of all that recent knowledge has brought to mankind.

On his last page (96), he suggests that those who agree with him should "unite and form a party resembling, in some respects at least, the modernist party in the Church of England, and further that the General Assembly should appoint a committee, composed of laymen and ministers as well as professors" to consider the matter. Very significant, surely, if we look to its point of origin!

F. J. POWICKE.

Dr. H. M. Foston's *Man and the Image of God* (Macmillan, 7s. 6d.) is, it must be confessed, a difficult book to grasp clearly, and therefore to evaluate exactly in spite of its author's frequent use of illustrations. That it is highly suggestive most would probably agree; but there is an ambiguity of meaning at some points which might have been avoided by closer definition of terms.

This is so particularly in the case of "feeling", which plays a large part in the argument, and one that is also characteristic. For in the working-out of the analogy between tri-Unity in the psychology of man and in the nature of God in terms of intellect, willing, feeling, it is this last which is used to adumbrate the special nature of the Father, as distinct from the Son (as *Logos*) and the Spirit (as Energy). This "parallelism" is justified by Dr. Foston on the two-fold basis of Love being the supreme form of feeling, and of the *N. T.* words "God is

Love". The exegesis here is very doubtful, as is shown *inter alia* by the related words " God is Light ". But besides this our author's own psychological account of feeling creates further difficulty. For while in " feeling " he stresses the elements of pleasure and pain in their elusively general nature, as distinct from their specific concomitant features in particular pleasures and pains, the attribution of such feeling (which seems bound up with a nervous system) to God seems incongruous. Again, if we adopt his view of the affinity between " feeling " and " value " (answering to that between " intellect " and " form ", which are specially associated with the Son or Logos), it is surely in virtue of the definitely ideal value of personality to the mind of God that we should think of His " loving " them. But in that case " feeling " would be a quite secondary aspect of the matter, and at best in a highly metaphorical sense. To make it the distinctive mode of the Father's being, in the Godhead, seems quite paradoxical.

There are in the book a good many interesting incidental observations. But in his main thesis Dr. Foston does not seem to be much more satisfying than Augustine and Aquinas in their use of the analogy between the psychological tri-Unity in men and God. VERNON BARTLET.

NEW EDITIONS AND REPRINTS.

A. F. KILPATRICK [Ed.]. 1 *Samuel* (R.V.); 2 *Samuel* (R.V.). Cambridge Univ. Press. 6s. 6d. each. The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges.

EDWIN BEVAN. *Hellenism and Christianity*. Allen & Unwin. 7s. 6d. Second and Cheap Edition.

Come, Let Us Worship. Kingsgate Press. 2s. 6d. "A Book of Common Worship for Use in Free Churches", a new and revised edition of the Rev. H. Bonner's book.

E. G. CARRE. *Praying Hyde*. Pickering. 2s. 6d.

URSULA BLOOM. *A Lamp in the Darkness*. Hutchinson. 3s. 6d. Newspaper articles.

J. URQUHART. *The Inspiration and Accuracy of the Holy Scriptures*. Pickering. 5s. 3rd Edition.

ALSO RECEIVED.

PAULINE TAYLOR. *A Free Church Psalter* in the Authorised Version. Dent. 1s. 6d. Pointed for chanting.

Hymns for To-day. Carey Press. 3s. 6d. and 2s. 6d. Words only, 3d. 118 hymns for young people.

E. I. LYNDON. *Prophetic Spokesmen*. Sharp. 2s. 6d. Short Addresses on the minor prophets.

HENRY COOK. *The Call of the Church*. Kingsgate Press. 1s. 6d. and 1s.

W. E. VINE. *The Gospel of the Bible*. Pickering. 2s. 6d.

A. J. GORDON. *In Christ*. Pickering. 2s. 6d.

F. H. HAINES. *A Lamp to the Feet*. Pure Thought Press. 6s.

H. PICKERING. *The Believers' Blue Book*. Pickering. 2s.

E. BARKER. *Twenty-One Difficult Texts in the Bible*. Pickering. 1s.

AMY LE FEUVRE. *A Madcap Family*. Pickering. 2s. 6d.

LECTURES, PAMPHLETS, ETC.

A. A. DAVID. *The Ideal of God*. Lindsey Press. 1s. Essex Hall Lecture.

C. J. J. WEBB. *Our Knowledge of One Another*. Milford. 1s. 6d. Hertz Lecture.

EDWYN BEVAN. *The Hope of a World to Come*. Allen and Unwin. 2s. and 1s. Arthur Davis Memorial Lecture.

JOHN DEWEY. *Construction and Criticism*. Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 4s. (25 pp!). Davies Memorial Lecture.

MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. *Women and Priesthood*. Longmans. 1s. Prepared for the Lambeth Conference, and contains a summary of the attitude of the different Churches here and on the Continent.

G. G. Coulton. *The Pope Not Infallible.* Simpkin. 1s.
Viscount Halifax. *The Good Estate of the Catholic Church.* Longmans. 1s. 6d.
Rendel Harris. *Peg O'Nell* (Heffer, 2s. 6d.); *Horus* (Heffer, 2s.). "Sunset Essays".
A Physician. *The Virgin Birth.* Bale & Danielsson. 1s.
Choice and Freedom. Friends' Book Centre. 1s. and 6d. Addressed to young Friends by the Friends' Education Committee.
E. G. Braham. *What Sunday Schools expect from Churches.* N.S.S.U. 3d. Written for the Adolescent Campaign of the N.S.S.U.
E. G. Braham. *The 'Teen Age Scholar.* N.S.S.U. 4d.
E. H. Hayes. *Your Sunday School Job; The Primary Section; The Junior Section. The 'Teen Age Section.* N.S.S.U. 4d. each. Based on chapters in *The Child in the Midst.*
Sir John Simon. *Two Broadcast Talks on India.* Faber & Faber. 1s.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS.

The Holborn (July). Two Congregational contributors are Dr. F. J. Powicke ("A Theology of Love") and Mr. W. H. Jacobsen ("The Ober-Ammergau Passion Play"). Among other articles are Dr. C. Ryder Smith's "The Early Hebrew Village", the Rev. C. H. S. Willson's "The Religious Teaching of Lily Dougall", Mr. W. Lavallin Puxley's "Volcanoes", and the Rev. James Gibb's "The Basic Principle of Protestantism".

The Hibbbert Journal (July). The opening article is an address given in Manchester College Chapel by Dr. Rabindranath Tagore. Philosophy is well represented, the articles including Prof. Boodin's "The Universe a Living Whole", and Prof. Alexander's "Truth, Goodness, and Beauty". The Rev. J. M. Lloyd Thomas writes on the Lambeth Conference and Mr. F. S. Marvin on "The Great Man". A very readable article is Miss Eadie's "A School in Treasure Island", while Dr. Vincent's subject is "Popular Christology". Dr. Moffatt contributes his "Survey of Theological Literature".

The London Quarterly (July). Mr. W. L. Puxley has an article here also, an interesting account of the "Australian Blacks". Dr. Frank Ballard writes with his usual vigour on "Romanism versus Christianity", and Dr. Vincent Taylor has an informing account of "Eduard Meyer". Miss A. M. Evans continues her study of Post-War Russia, Dr. Sydney Cave writes on "Our Preaching of God", and Dr. R. Newton Flew on "The Ideal of St. Augustine".

The Baptist Quarterly (July). There is a useful, unsigned article about the Mennonites. Dr. Underwood writes on "The Early Relations of Horton Academy and Rawdon College with Lancashire". Mr. W. S. Samuel continues the account of Charles-Marie de Veil.

The Modern Churchman (June-Aug.). Perhaps the most important contributions in these numbers are Canon Streeter's reply to criticisms on *The Primitive Church,* Dean Inge's "The Modern Christian Teacher and His Difficulties", the Rev. J. S. Bezzant's "The Exemplarist Doctrine of the Atonement", and Dr. N. Macnicol's "India and the Future of Christianity".

The Church Quarterly Review (July). Bishop Gore writes against the South India proposals and Bishop Palmer answers objections to them. Brig.-Gen. Bruce answers the question "Does China Want Christianity?" and the Dean of Winchester writes on "Dante and Jerusalem". The Archdeacon of Worcester discusses the Rev. Roland Allen's plea for Voluntary Clergy.

The Expository Times (July-Sep.). The Bishop of Ripon in writing on "War" in the series on "The Mind of Christ on Moral Problems of To-day" makes good use of the addresses delivered at the Autumnal Meetings of the Congregational Union last year. In the same series is Mr. J. L. Paton's "Temperance". Dr. MacKinnon writes on "The Contribution of Germany to Church History".

Friends' Quarterly Examiner (Seventh Month). Mr. H. G. Wood answers the question "What do we mean by the Inner Light ?". Mr. C. E. Stansfield discusses "The place of a Teaching Ministry in Quaker Meetings"; Mr. Edward

Cadbury tells of the work of "Woodbrooke", and Mr. F. J. Gillman of "Friends and Adult Education".

Bulletin of The John Rylands Library, Manchester (July). In a short article Dr. Mingana tells of a Syriac manuscript attributing the Fourth Gospel to John the Younger "who spoke in Greek in Bithynia". Other contributions are Prof. Charlton's "Romanticism in Shakespeare's Comedy", Dr. Conway's "The Originality of Cicero", and Mr. Wright Roberts's "William Caxton, Writer and Critic". A large part of the *Bulletin* is occupied by Dr. Mingana's translation of "The Apocalypse of Peter".

The Review of the Churches (July). There are three valuable articles on "Religion and Amusements" by the Rev. W. H. Armstrong, Mr. Kenneth Ingram, and Canon T. Guy Rogers. Dr. Adolf Keller tells of "The International Activities of the Churches", and Viscount Wolmer writes on "Shall the Establishment be Ended or Mended?". Mr. J. O. Dobson's "Modern Franciscan Movements" is well worth reading. 30 pages are given to Editorial and deal mostly with the question of Church Union.

The British Journal of Inebriety (July). The two main articles in the Journal are Dr. P. C. Barham's "Some Difficulties of the Institutional Treatment of Alcohol and Other Drug Addictions", and Dr. R. D. Gillespie's "Insomnia and Drug Addiction".

The International Review of Missions (July). Dr. Rudolf Otto writes on "The Indian Doctrine of Grace, and the Christian", quoting an apparent parallel to the parable of the Prodigal Son. Dr. Meston writes on "Education in India", Mr. A. Victor Murray on "Christianity and Rural Civilization", and Dr. S. K. Datta on "Inter-Racial Relationships in the Far East". A valuable article is "The Religion of My Fathers" by an African, while Dr. Agnes Fraser's "The Place of Missions in Spreading a Knowledge of Health and Hygiene in Village Life" is an informing summary.

World Dominion (July). This journal increases in size and, if possible, in interest and usefulness. We cannot pretend to outline all the articles, or even to mention the parts of the Mission Field with which they deal. Mr. Shoran S. Singha's "An Indian on India", and the Rev. A. McLeish's "India's Missionary Problems" will perhaps attract most interest.

The Evangelical Quarterly (July). The Rev. J. Garrow Duncan identifies various sites in and around Jerusalem. Prof. Dr. G. Ch. Aalders writes on "The Historical Trustworthiness of the Book of Daniel", and the Rev. A. H. T. Clarke on "The Bishops' Task in the Lambeth Conference". "A Study of Cardinal Newman" is by the Rev. John McNeilage.

The Harvard Theological Review (April). Prof. Maurice Goguel writes on "The Problem of Jesus", and Mr. W. E. Clark on "Some Problems in the Criticism of the Sources for Early Buddhist History".

The Yale Review (Summer). Mr. C. P. Howland writes on the Naval Disarmament Conference, Miss K. F. Gerould on "Men, Women and Thrillers", and Miss Virginia Woolf on "Augustine Birrell". There are two very interesting stories by Walter de la Mare and Cyril Hume, and a very readable sketch by Mr. A. E. Newton, "In Dimpled Devonshire".

The Review and Expositor (Bapt., Louisville, Kentucky, July). Dr. K. S. Latourette discusses "Present-Day Problems and Changing Policies in the Missionary Enterprise", and Mr. A. L. Vail "Is the Holy Spirit Really God?" Dr. F. J. Mallett, in a very proper article answers the question "Does the Bible contain Humour?", and the Rev. F. C. Spurr writes on "The Miracles of Christ, and their Modern Denial".

The Anglican Theological Review (July). Dr. F. C. Grant is on his own ground in "Economic Messianism and the Teaching of Jesus". Other articles are Mr. C. A. Manning's "Dostoyevsky and Western Christianity"; Mr. F. W. Buckler's "The Meaning of the Cross", Mr. C. Caplan's "Angels in the *Book of Enoch*", and a selection of parallels between Plato and the New Testament by Mr. C. Murley.

The Biblical Review (July). Dr. Deissmann describes the excavations in Ephesus, and three country pastors tell how they regard their work. The Rev. W. Thompson writes on "The Counter-Prophets", and Dr. C. L. Goodell deals with the question, "Does the Laity want Evangelical preaching?"